arXiv:math/0602147v1 [math.AP] 7 Feb 2006

Stability Estimates for Coefficients of Magnetic Schrödinger Equation From Full and Partial Boundary Measurements

Leo Tzou*
Department of Mathematics
University of Washington
Seattle Washington 98105

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we establish a *log log*-type estimate which shows that in dimension $n \geq 3$ the magnetic field and the electric potential of the magnetic Schrödinger equation depends stably on the Dirichlet to Neumann (DN) map even when the boundary measurement is taken only on a subset that is slightly larger than half of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Furthermore, we prove that in the case when the measurement is taken on all of $\partial\Omega$ one can establish a better estimate that is of *log*-type. The proofs involve the use of the complex geometric optics (CGO) solutions of the magnetic Schrödinger equation constructed in [8] then follow a similar line of argument as in [1]. In the partial data estimate we follow the general strategy of [5] by using the Carleman estimate established in [4] and a continuous dependence result for analytic continuation developed in [14].

1 Introduction

Throughout this article we assume that the dimension $n \geq 3$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open bounded set with C^∞ boundary, we are interested in the magnetic Schrödinger operator

$$H_{W,q} := D^2 + W \cdot D + D \cdot W + W^2 + q$$

with real vector valued magnetic potential $W \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and the bounded electric potential $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. As usual, $D := -i\nabla$. For simplicity, we assume throughout that for all (W, q) under consideration 0 is not an eigenvalue of the operator $H_{W,q} : H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$.
Let ν be the unit outer normal. Under the present assumptions, the Dirichlet problem

$$H_{W,q}u = 0 \qquad u \mid_{\partial\Omega} = f$$

has a unique solution in $H^1(\Omega)$, and we can introduce the Dirichlet to Neumann (DN) map $\Lambda_{W,q} : H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega) \to H^{-1/2}(\Omega)$ associated with the magnetic Schrödinger operator $H_{W,q}$ by

$$\Lambda_{W,q} : f \mapsto (\partial_\nu + iW \cdot \nu)u \mid_{\partial\Omega}$$

---

[*] This research was supported by the Doctoral Post-Graduate Scholarship from the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

The inverse problem under consideration is to recover information about the magnetic and electric potential from the DN map measured on a subset of the boundary.

In the absence of the magnetic potential, the identifiability problem was solved by [7] for when the measurement is taken on the whole boundary. Recently, Kenig-Sjöstrand-Uhlmann in [6] showed that the same result holds even if the measurement is taken on possibly a very small subset of the boundary. The issue of stability without the magnetic potential was first addressed by Alessandrini in [1] for the full data problem and later by Heck-Wang [5] when the data is measured on a subset that is slightly larger than half of the boundary.

In the presence of a magnetic potential, it was noted in [11] that the DN map is gauge invariant. Namely, given any $\mathcal{P} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\mathcal{P} \mid_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, one has $\Lambda_{W+\nabla\mathcal{P},q} = \Lambda_{W,q}$. Therefore, the magnetic potential is not uniquely determined by $\Lambda_{W,q}$. However, as was shown in [4], the magnetic field dW and electric potential q are uniquely determined even if the measurement is taken only on a small part of the boundary. Furthermore, recently in [9] a method was given for reconstructing the magnetic field and electric potential under some regularity assumptions on the magnetic potential.

Following the above identifiability and reconstruction results, it is natural to ask whether small perturbations in the DN map would lead to small changes in the dW and q determined by $\Lambda_{W,q}$. This paper establishes a *log log*-type stability estimate for dW and q in the case when the measurement is taken only on a chosen subset of $\partial\Omega$. In the process we will also show that if one has full data measurements, the result can be improved to a *log*-type estimate. As mentioned before, when the magnetic potential is absent, the full and partial data estimates are established in [1] and [5] respectively by using complex geometric optics (CGO) solutions to the Schrödinger equation that approximate plane waves. We follow a similar strategy except that in the presence of the magnetic field we need to use a richer set of CGO solutions studied in [8] and [9].

This article is organized into three parts. In part I we need to prove some fine properties of the CGO solutions that were not considered in previous studies. This is because the existing theory in [8] and [9] are sufficient for identifiability and reconstruction results but a slightly more refined understand is necessary for establishing stability. The difficult issue is the following. Given an $M > 0$, $R > 0$ $p > n$ we consider the family of compactly supported vector fields

$$\mathcal{W}(M,R) := \{W \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \|W\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq M, \|divW\|_{L^\infty} \leq M \ and \ supp(W) \subset B_R\}$$

and the family of compactly supported electric potentials

$$\mathcal{Q}(M,R) := \{q \in L^\infty \mid \|q\|_{L^\infty} \leq M, supp(q) \subset B_R\}$$

In order to prove stability, we need to show that the CGO solutions to the equation $H_{W,q}u = 0$ has remainder decaying uniformly for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$, $q \in \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$. More precisely,

Proposition 1.1 *Let σ_0, θ be positive numbers satisfying $\sigma_0 + \theta < \frac{1}{4n+6}$. For all $M > 0$ and $R > 0$ there exists constants $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$ depending on dimension, p, σ_0, θ, M and R only such that for all $(W,q) \in \mathcal{W}(M,R) \times \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\zeta \cdot \zeta = 0$ and $|\zeta| \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$, there exists solutions to $H_{W,q}u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the form*

$$u(x,\zeta) = e^{i\zeta\cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi^\sharp} + r(x,\zeta)), \qquad \|r(\cdot,\zeta)\|_{H^t_\delta} \leq C|\zeta|^{t-\epsilon}, \qquad t \in [0,2]$$

where $\varphi^\sharp$ is defined by

$$\varphi^\sharp(x) = \frac{-\sqrt{2}\zeta}{2\pi|\zeta|} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{W^\sharp(x - y_1\frac{\sqrt{2}Re(\zeta)}{|\zeta|} - y_2\frac{\sqrt{2}Im(\zeta)}{|\zeta|})}{y_1 + iy_2}$$

Here $\chi_{|\zeta|} = \chi(x/|\zeta|^{\theta})$ *with* $\chi(x)$ *being a smooth function supported in the unit ball and is* 1 *near zero, and* $W^{\sharp}$ *is the convolution of* W *with the mollifier defined by*

$$W^{\sharp}(x) = \int |\zeta|^{n\sigma_0}\chi(y|\zeta|^{\sigma_0})W(x-y)dy$$

In part II, we use the CGO solutions constructed above to prove stability for the full data problem. The computation for the magnetic field stability is analogous to the one given for the electric potential in [1] combined with some ideas in [9].

Theorem 1.1 *Let* Ω *be a bounded open subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with smooth boundary. For all* $M > 0$*, there exists a* $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ *such that the estimate*

$$\|I_{\Omega}d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ *and* $q_1, q_2 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ *satisfying* $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$ $(l = 1, 2)$ *and* $W_1 = W_2$ *on* $\partial\Omega$*. Here* $I_{\Omega}(x)$ *is the indicator function of* Ω.

The estimate for the electric potentials, however, is slightly more involved. Unlike the identifiability results in [8] and [4], the above theorem does not make the first order terms in the magnetic Schrödinger equation vanish. Therefore, complications would arise when one tries to establish the estimate for the (lower order) electric potentials in the presence of the (higher order) magnetic fields. To remedy this difficulty, we first show by using the Hodge decomposition that the d operator on differential forms is in some sense "bounded invertible" when restricted to the right subspaces. Then we will combine this fact with the estimate we have for $d(W_1 - W_2)$ to obtain the estimate for the electric potentials.

Theorem 1.2 *Let* Ω *be a bounded open subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with smooth boundary. For all* $M > 0$*, there exists a* $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ *such that the estimate*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ *and* $q_1, q_2 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ *satisfying* $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$ $(l = 1, 2)$ *and* $W_1 |_D = W_2 |_D$ *on* $\partial\Omega$.

In part III we assume knowledge of the DN map on a subset of $\partial\Omega$ that is only slightly larger than half of the boundary and prove a stability result that is weaker than the ones above. To give a precise statement of the theorems would require more defintions and therefore they will be stated in the introduction section of part III. The proof follows the idea employed in [5] where one uses a Carleman estimate that is established in [4] to help suppress the missing piece of information and obtain an estimate for the difference of the Fourier transform on a wedge in phase space. To extend the estimate from the wedge to a ball we will use a continuous dependence result for analytic continuation developed in [14]. After this is established, the stability result for the magnetic field and electric potential would follow by similar calculations done in part II.

PART I - Fine Properties of CGO Solution

2 Properties of Transport Equations

To establish stability we will need to construct complex geometric optics (CGO) solutions to $H_{W_l,q_l}u_l = 0$ that are of the form

$$u_l = e^{i\zeta_l\cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi_l^\sharp} + r_l(x,|\zeta|))$$

where $\zeta_l\cdot\zeta_l = 0$ and $\varphi_l^\sharp$ satisfies the transport equation

$$-\mu\cdot\nabla\varphi_l^\sharp = \mu_l\cdot W_l^\sharp$$

here $\mu_l\in\mathbb{C}^n$ is defined by $\zeta_l = \frac{|\zeta_l|}{\sqrt{2}}\mu_l$ and $W_l^\sharp$ is the convolution of W_l with a mollifier. In this section we will collect some properties regarding how $\varphi^\sharp$ depends on W_l and the unit vector μ_l. Throughout this article we will denote by N_μ^{-1} to be the inverse of the operator $\mu\cdot\nabla$. More precisely,

$$N_\mu^{-1}(f) := \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{R^2}\frac{f(x - Re(\mu)y_1 - Im(\mu)y_2)}{y_1 + iy_2}dy_1dy_2$$

for all $f\in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The general properties of this operator is summarized in the following two lemmas which we will state without proof. Interested reader can see [9].

Lemma 2.1 *Let $f\in W_0^{k,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})$ with $f = 0$ for $|x| > R$. Then $u = N_\mu^{-1}f\in W^{k,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solves the equation $\mu\cdot\nabla u = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and satisfies for all multi-index $|\alpha|\le k$*

$$|\partial^\alpha u(x)| \le C(\tilde{\Omega})\|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}(1 + |x_T|^2)^{-1/2}I_{B_R}(x_\perp)$$

where x_T is the projection of x to the plane $T = span\{Re(\mu), Im(\mu)\}$, $x_\perp = x - x_T$ and I_{B_R} is the indicator function of the ball of radius R around 0.

Sometimes we need a version of lemma 2.1 where f and μ depend on a parameter. Let $V\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and let $\gamma_j(\xi)$ $(j = 1,2)$ be a C^∞ function of $\xi\in V$ which satisfy

$$1 - \epsilon \le |\gamma_j(\xi)| \le 1 + \epsilon, \quad |\gamma_1(\xi)\cdot\gamma_2(\xi)| \le \epsilon$$

and also $|\partial^\alpha\gamma_j(\xi)| \le M_1$ for $|\alpha|\ge 1$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough and let $f(x,\xi)\in C^\infty(R^n\times V)$ satisfy $f(x,\xi) = 0$ for $|x| > R$. Then the function*

$$u(x,\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{1}{y_1 + iy_2}f(x - y_1\gamma_1(\xi) - y_2\gamma_2(\xi),\xi)dy_1dy_2$$

is in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times V)$ solves $(\gamma_1(\xi) + \gamma_2(\xi))\cdot\nabla_x u = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha\partial_\xi^\beta u(x,\xi)| \le C_{\alpha,\beta,R,M_1}\Big(\sum_{|\gamma+\delta|\le|\alpha+\beta|}\|\partial_x^\gamma\partial_\xi^\delta f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times V)}\Big) < x_T >^{|\beta|-1}\chi_{B_M}(x_\perp)$$

where x_T is the projection of x to the plane $T = span\{\gamma_1(\xi),\gamma_2(\xi)\}$ and $x_\perp = x - x_T$

In proving stability we will be interested in the dependence of the $N_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W)$ on the parameter μ. The next lemma states that the dependence is continuous provided that W behaves reasonably well.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $W \in C_c^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega})$ with $\|W\|_{C_c^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq M$. For any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in S^{n-1} + iS^{n-1}$ such that $Re(\mu_l) \perp Im(\mu_l)$ for $l = 1, 2$ we have the following estimate*

$$\|N_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W) - N_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C|\mu_1 - \mu_2|^t$$

and the constant depends only on the size of $\tilde{\Omega}$ and is uniform for all $\|W\|_{C_c^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq M$.

Proof
Since W is supported in the bounded set $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $Im(\mu_l) \perp Re(\mu_l)$, we have that there exists an $R > 0$ such that $W(x - Re(\mu_l)y_1 - Im(\mu_l)y_2) = 0$ for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and $|y_1 e_1 + y_2 e_2| \geq R$. Therefore we have for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&|N_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W)(x) - N_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W(x))| \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}|\int_{B_R} \frac{\mu_2 \cdot W(x - Re(\mu_2)y_1 - Im(\mu_2)y_2) - \mu_1 \cdot W(x - Re(\mu_1)y_1 - Im(\mu_1)y_2)}{y_1 + iy_2} dy_1 dy_2| \\
&\leq C \int_{B_R} \frac{|\mu_2 - \mu_2|\|W\|_{L^\infty} + \|W\|_{C^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega})}(|Re(\mu_1 - \mu_2)y_1| + |Im(\mu_1 - \mu_2)y_2|)^t}{y_1 + iy_2} dy_1 dy_2 \\
&\leq CR|\mu_1 - \mu_2|\|W\|_{L^\infty} + CR^2\|W\|_{C^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega})}|\mu_2 - \mu_2|^t
\end{aligned}$$

So we have $\|N_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W) - N_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C|\mu_1 - \mu_2|^t$ as desired. $\square$

Combining lemma 2.3 and lemma 2.1 we have the following corollary which will be useful later on.

Corollary 2.4 *Under the same hypothesis as lemma 2.3 we have the following estimate on the exponential*

$$\|e^{iN_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W)} - e^{iN_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W)}\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C(M, \tilde{\Omega})|\mu_1 - \mu_2|^t$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on the size of $\tilde{\Omega}$ and M.

Proof
By lemma 2.1 there exists an M' such that $\|N_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq M'$ whenever $\|W\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq M$. Since the map $z \mapsto e^{iz}$ is Lipchitz in the closure of the ball $B_{M'} \subset \mathbb{C}$, we have that

$$|e^{iN_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W)(x)} - e^{iN_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W)(x)}| \leq C(M')|N_{\mu_1}^{-1}(-\mu_1 \cdot W)(x) - N_{\mu_2}^{-1}(-\mu_2 \cdot W)(x)|$$

for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$. Now apply lemma 2.3 we have the desired estimate for the exponential.$\square$

Let η_ϵ be the standard mollifier and denote by $W^\sharp = \eta_\epsilon * W$. The next lemma tells us how well $e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W^\sharp)}$ approximates $e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W)}$.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $W \in C_c^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|W\|_{C_c^{0,t}(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$. We have the following estimate*

$$\|e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W^\sharp)} - e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu \cdot W)}\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq Ce^{2CM}M\epsilon^t$$

for all $\mu \in S^{n-1} + iS^{n-1}$ with orthonormal unit real and imaginary part.

Proof
Pick $R > 0$ large enough such that for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ $W(x - y_1 Re(\mu) - y_2 Im(\mu)) = 0$ whenever $|y_1 e_1 + y_2 e_2| > R$. Then we have for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu\cdot W^\sharp)(x)} - e^{iN_\mu^{-1}(-\mu\cdot W)(x)}| &\leq e^{2M}|N_\mu^{-1}(-\mu\cdot W^\sharp) - N_\mu^{-1}(-\mu\cdot W)| \\
&\leq e^{2M}\int_{B_R}\frac{|(W^\sharp - W)(x - y_1 Re(\mu) - y_2 Im(\mu))|}{|y_1 + iy_2|} \\
&\leq \epsilon^t e^{2M} M \int_{B_R}\frac{1}{|y_1 + iy_2|}
\end{aligned}$$

so the lemma is complete. □
The following result on nonlinear Fourier transform was used by Salo [9] in reconstruction methods. We will repeat it here for convenience of the reader. Similar ideas appear in Sun [11] and Eskin-Ralston [2]

Lemma 2.6 *Assume that* $\gamma \perp \tilde{\gamma} \perp \xi$ *with* $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \in S^{n-1}$ *and define* $\mu = \gamma + i\tilde{\gamma}$. *Define* $\Phi(x) := N_\mu^{-1}(-\mu\cdot W)$ *with vector field* $W \in L_c^\infty$. *Then we have the following identity for the nonlinear Fourier transform:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu\cdot W e^{i\xi\cdot x}e^{i\Phi(x)}dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu\cdot W e^{i\xi\cdot x}dx$$

Proof
Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mu = e_1 + ie_2$ since the general case can be reduced to this case via an orthonormal linear transform. With this choice of μ, $\xi = (0, 0, \xi')$ with $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} W(x)\cdot\mu e^{i\xi\cdot x}e^{i\Phi(x)}dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(-(\partial_1 + i\partial_2)\Phi(x))e^{i\Phi}e^{i\xi'\cdot x'}dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} e^{i\xi'\cdot x'}h(x')dx'$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
h(x') &= i\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\partial_1 + i\partial_2)e^{i\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')}dx_1dx_2 = \lim_{R\to\infty} i \int\limits_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|\leq R}(\partial_1 + i\partial_2)e^{i\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')}dx_1dx_2 \\
&= i\lim_{R\to\infty}\int\limits_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|=R} e^{i\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')}(\nu_1 + i\nu_2)dS(x_1,x_2)
\end{aligned}$$

When $|x_1e_1 + x_2e_2|$ gets large, $e^{i\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')} = 1 + i\Phi + O(|\Phi|^2) = 1 + i\Phi + O(|x_1e_1 + x_2e_2|^{-2})$ by lemma 2.1 so

$$\begin{aligned}
i\lim_{R\to\infty}\int\limits_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|=R} e^{i\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')}(\nu_1 + i\nu_2)dS &= -\lim_{R\to\infty}\int\limits_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|=R}\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')(\nu_1 + i\nu_2)dS \\
&= -\int_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|\leq R}(\partial_1 + i\partial_2)\Phi(x_1,x_2,x')dx_1dx_2 \\
&= \int_{|x_1e_1+x_2e_2|\leq R}\mu\cdot W(x_1,x_2,x')dx_1dx_2
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete.□

3 Semiclassical pseudodifferential calculus

The results which appear in [9], [11], and [8] rely on solutions to $H_{W,q}u = 0$ that are of the form

$$u(x,\zeta) = e^{\zeta\cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi^\sharp} + r(x,\zeta))$$

where φ is the solution of some transport equation and $r(x,\zeta)$ satisfies

$$\|r(\cdot,\zeta)\|_{H^t_\delta} \leq C(W,q)|\zeta|^{t-\epsilon}, \qquad t \in [0,2]$$

The situation in establishing stability is more delicate, however, since one considers a family of magnetic and electric potentials satisfying certain a-priori estimates. Therefore, more care is needed if we wish to establish a stability estimate that is uniform for all magnetic potentials under consideration. In particular, we need to ensure that the constant C which appears in the above estimate for the remainder term $r(x,\zeta)$ is uniformly bounded for all W satisfying our a-priori assumption. It is with this in mind that we develop some explicit estimates for semi-classical ΨDO in terms of its symbols. Most of the results in this section are well know but we will nevertheless include proofs or exact references for completeness. All integration of symbols against complex exponentials are understood to be oscillatory integrals (see [12]). We begin with a fundamental result which gives a sharp estimate on the operator norm of the ΨDO by its symbol:

Proposition 3.1 *(Calderon-Vaillancourt) There exists a $k(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on dimension of $\mathbb{R}^n$ only such that for all semiclassical symbols $a(x,\xi;h) \in S^0_\sigma$ with $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2$, the following estimate on $\|Op_h(a)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ holds for all $0 < h \leq 1$*

$$\|Op_h(a)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq (2\pi)^{-n}\|\mathcal{B}\|_{TR} \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta|\leq k(n)} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)$$

where $p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a semi-norm on S^0_σ defined by $p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) := \sup_{x,\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n, 0<h\leq 1}\{h^{\sigma(|\alpha|+|\beta|)}|\partial^\alpha\partial^\beta a(x,\xi;h)|\}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is the ΨDO of trace class defined by the symbol $\mathcal{B}(x)\mathcal{B}(\xi)$ with $\hat{\mathcal{B}}(\xi) =<\xi>^{-2k(n)}$.

Proof
The proposition can be reduced to proving estimates for classical ΨDO of symbol order zero. In particular, the classical result by Calderon (see for example p.10 Vol. II of [13]) states that for any classical symbol $a(x,\xi)$ of order zero we have the following estimate for the corresponding operator A:

$$\|Au\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq (2\pi)^{-n}\|\mathcal{B}\|_{TR}\|a(x,\xi)\|_{C^k(\mathbb{R}^n_x,\mathbb{R}^n_\xi)} \tag{1}$$

Now for all $a(x,\xi;h) \in S^0_\sigma$ define for each fixed $h > 0$ the (classical) symbol $a_h(x,\xi) := a(\sqrt{h}x, \sqrt{h}\xi; h)$ of order zero. Observe that we have the following relationship between the semi-classical quantization $Op_h(a)$ and the classical quantization of $a_h(x,\xi)$:

$$(Op_h(a)u)(x) = \sqrt{h}^{-n} A_h u_h(x)$$

where $u_h(x)$ is defined by its Fourier transform $\hat{u}_h(\xi) := \hat{u}(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{h}})$ and A_h is the operator associated to the (classical) symbol $a_h(x,\xi)$. The proposition then follows after some simple calculation by applying (1) to A_h and use the fact that $\sigma \leq 1/2$. □
We will hence forth denote by $k(n)$ to be the smallest integer for which proposition 3.1 holds. Now

we will derive a result regarding the composition of semi-classical ΨDO. It is well known fact that if $a, b \in S^0_\sigma$ then $Op_h(b)Op_h(b) = Op(ab) + h^{1-2\sigma} Op_h S^0_\sigma$. However, we need an explicit estimate of the semi-norms of the remainder by the semi-norms of a, b. The next lemma establishes this but is only interesting for $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4n+6}$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $a(x, \xi; h), b(x, \xi; h) \in S^0_\sigma$ be semiclassical symbols. We have the identity*

$$Op_h(a)Op_h(b) = Op_h(c)$$

where $c \in S^0_\sigma$ satisfies

$$c(x, \xi; h) = a(x, \xi; h)b(x, \xi; h) + h^{1-\sigma(4n+6)} m(x, \xi; h)$$

with $m(x, \xi; h) \in S^0_\sigma$. Furthermore, the semi-norms of $m(x, \xi; h)$ satisfies

$$p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(m) \le C_{\alpha,\beta}\Big(\sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'| \le |\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+3} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(a) + \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'| \le |\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+3} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(b)\Big)$$

The constant $C_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ depends only on α, β and the dimension.

Proof

Simple calculation yields that

$$Op_h(a)Op_h(b)u(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} c(x, h\xi; h) e^{ix\cdot\xi} \hat{u}(\xi) d\xi$$

where

$$c(x, \xi; h) := \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i\frac{<x-y,\xi-\eta>}{h}} a_h(x, \eta) b_h(y, \xi) d\eta dy$$

For the sake of clarity, in this calculation we denote by $a_h(x, \xi) := a(x, \xi; h)$. Make change of variable $y' = y - x$

$$c(x, \xi; h) := \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\frac{<y',\xi-\eta>}{h}} a_h(x, \eta) b_h(y' + x, \xi) d\eta dy$$

Taylor formula gives $b_h(y' + x, \xi) = b_h(x, \xi) + \sum\limits_{|\alpha|=1} y'^\alpha \int_0^1 (\partial^\alpha_x b_h)(x + \theta y', \xi) d\theta$. Substitute this into the above equation we get

$$c(x, \xi; h) := \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\frac{<y',\xi-\eta>}{h}} a_h(x, \eta)(b_h(x, \xi) + \sum_{|\alpha|=1} y'^\alpha \int_0^1 (\partial^\alpha_x b_h)(x + \theta y', \xi) d\theta) d\eta dy$$

The first term in this can be computed explicitly by using Fourier and inverse Fourier formula.

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\frac{<y',\xi-\eta>}{h}} a_h(x, \eta)(b_h(x, \xi) d\eta dy = b(x, \xi; h)a(x, \xi; h) \tag{2}$$

The next term will be the remainder which we will compute as explicitly as possible

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\frac{<y',\xi-\eta>}{h}} a_h(x, \eta) \sum_{|\alpha|=1} y'^\alpha \int_0^1 (\partial^\alpha_x b_h)(x + \theta y', \xi) d\theta d\eta dy' \quad = \quad h^{1-(4n+6)\sigma} m(x, \xi; h)$$

where $m(x,\xi;h)$ is given by the formula

$$m(x,\xi;h) := \frac{-ih^{(4n+6)\sigma}}{(2\pi)^n} \times$$
$$\sum_{|\alpha|=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{e^{i<y,\eta>}((I-\Delta_\eta)^{n+1}\partial_\eta^\alpha a_h)(x,\eta+\xi)(I-\Delta_y)^{n+1}\int_0^1(\partial_x^\alpha b_h)(x+\theta hy,\xi)d\theta}{(1+|\eta|^2)^{n+1}(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}} d\eta dy$$

So $c(x,\xi;h)$ can be written as $a(x,\xi;h)b(x,\xi;h) + h^{1-(2n+4)\sigma}m(x,\xi;h)$. It remains to check that $m(x,\xi;h) \in S^0_\sigma$ and satisfies the seminorm estimates stated in the lemma. Observe that for all multi-indices β,γ,

$$\sup_{\eta,x,\xi,h>0} |h^{(|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3)\sigma}(I-\Delta_\eta)^{n+1}\partial_\xi^\gamma\partial_x^\beta\partial_\eta^\alpha a_h(x,\eta+\xi;h)| \leq \sum_{\alpha',\beta'\leq|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(a) \qquad (3)$$

and the same holds for $b(x,\xi;h)$. The term involving the Laplacian in y is

$$(I-\Delta_y)^{n+1}\Big\{\frac{\int_0^1(\partial_x^\alpha b_h)(x+\theta hy,\xi)d\theta}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}\Big\}$$

Taking derivatives of $\frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}$ results only in more decay, therefore

$$h^{(|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3)\sigma}(I-\Delta_y)^{n+1}\partial_\xi^\gamma\partial_x^\beta\Big\{\frac{\int_0^1(\partial_x^\alpha b_h)(x+\theta hy,\xi)d\theta}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}\Big\} \leq C_n \frac{\sum_{\alpha',\beta'\leq|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3} p_{\alpha',\beta'}(b)}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}$$

where C_n depends only on the dimension n. Combining the above inequality and (3) in addition to the fact that $\frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}$ is integrable in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain directly from the definition of $m(x,\xi;h)$ that for all multi-indices β,γ,

$$\begin{aligned} h^{\sigma(|\gamma|+|\beta|)}\partial_\xi^\gamma\partial_x^\beta m(x,\xi;h) \quad &\leq \quad C_{n,\alpha,\beta}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{n+1}}dy\Big)^2 \times \\ &\Big(\sum_{\alpha',\beta'\leq|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(a) + \sum_{\alpha',\beta'\leq|\beta|+|\gamma|+2n+3} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(b)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

holds for all $x,\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < h \leq 1$ and the constant $C_{n,\gamma,\beta}$ depends only on dimension and multi-indices γ,β. $\square$

Given $a \in S^0_\sigma$ one can define a formal adjoint to $Op_h(a)$ in the usual way. It turns out that $Op_h(a)^*$ is also a semi-classical ΨDO with symbol denoted by $a^* \in S^0_\sigma$. Finer properties of this symbol is developed in the next lemma

Lemma 3.2 *Let $a \in S^0_\sigma$ for $\sigma \leq 1/2$. Then $Op_h(a)^* = Op_h(a^*)$ with $a^* \in S^0_\sigma$. Furthermore, semi-norms of $a^*(x,\xi,h)$ can be bounded by semi-norms of $a(x,\xi,h)$ in the sense that for all multi-indices α,β*

$$p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a^*) \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\leq|\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+2} p_{\alpha',\beta'}(a)$$

with $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ depending only on the multi-indices and dimension.

Proof

For each fixed $h > 0$, set $a_h(x,\xi) := a(x,h\xi;h)$ and define the (classical) pseudodifferential operator

$$A_h u := \int e^{i<x,\xi>} a_h(x,\xi)\hat{u}(\xi)d\xi = Op_h(a)u$$

With this notation we have for the formal adjoint $Op_h(a)^* = A_h^*$. By the result in classical pseudodifferential operator, A_h^* can be written as

$$A_h^* u = \int e^{i<x,\xi>} a^*(x, h\xi; h)\hat{u}(\xi) d\xi$$

provided we set

$$a^*(x, \eta; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int \int e^{i\frac{<z,\xi>}{h}} a(x+z, \xi - \eta; h) d\xi dz$$

It now remains to show that $a^*(x, \eta; h) \in S_\sigma^0$ and that its semi-norms satisfy the desired estimates. Taking $(I - h\Delta)^{n+1}$ of the exponential and integrate by parts as in the previous lemma we obtain

$$a^*(x, \eta; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int \int \frac{e^{i\frac{<z,\xi>}{h}}}{(1 + \frac{1}{h}|\xi|^2)^{n+1}} (I - h\Delta_z)^{n+1} \frac{(I - h\Delta_\xi)^{n+1} a(x+z, \xi - \eta; h)}{(1 + \frac{1}{h}|z|^2)^{n+1}} d\xi dz$$

Make the change of variable $z' = \frac{z}{\sqrt{h}}$, $\xi' = \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{h}}$ and observing that $(I - h\Delta_z) = (I - \Delta_{z'})$ we get

$$a^*(x, \eta; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int \int \frac{e^{i<z,\xi>}}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^{n+1}} (I - \Delta_{z'})^{n+1} \frac{(I - \Delta_{\xi'})^{n+1} a(x + \sqrt{h}z', \sqrt{h}\xi' - \eta; h)}{(1 + |z|^2)^{n+1}} d\xi' dz'$$

The semi-norm estimates now follows by similar arguments used in the previous lemma. □
Sometimes it is useful to conjugate $Op_h(a)$ with $< hD >^s$ to produce another semi-classical ΨDO of class $Op_h(S_\sigma^0)$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $a \in S_\sigma^0$. For $|s| \leq 3$ we have $< hD >^{-s} Op_h(a) < hD >^s = Op_h(b)$ with $b \in S_\sigma^0$ and semi-norms of b are bounded by semi-norms of a in the usual sense:*

$$p_{\alpha,\beta}^\sigma(b) \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'| \leq n+3+|\alpha|+|\beta|} p_{\alpha',\beta'}^\sigma(a)$$

Proof Simple computation shows that we can write

$$< hD >^{-s} Op_h(a) < hD >^s f(x) = \int e^{i<\xi,x>} b(x, h\xi; h)\hat{f}(\xi) d\xi$$

provided we take

$$b(x, \xi; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int \int e^{\frac{i}{h}<x-y,\xi-\eta>} < \eta >^{-s} a(y, \xi) < \xi >^s dy d\eta$$

We now need to check that $b(x, \xi; h)$ does indeed satisfy the desired estimates. Make a change of variables and integrate by parts we get that

$$b(x, \xi; h) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int \int e^{i<y,\eta>} (I - \Delta_\eta)^{n+1} \frac{< \xi - \eta >^{-s} < \xi >^s}{(1 + |\eta|^2)^{n+3}} \frac{(I - \Delta_y)^{n+3} a(x - hy, \xi; h)}{(1 + |y|^2)^{n+1}} dy d\eta$$

By Peetre inequality, $< \xi - \eta >^{-s} < \xi >^s \leq < \eta >^s$. Since $|s| \leq 2$ this means that $\frac{<\xi-\eta>^{-s}<\xi>^s}{(1+|\eta|^2)^{n+3}} \leq \frac{1}{(1+|\eta|^2)^{n+1}}$ and is therefore integrable. It is easily seen by straight forward computation (or taking the logarithm then differentiate) that for all multi-indices β

$$\partial_\xi^\beta (I - \Delta_\eta)^{n+1} \frac{< \xi - \eta >^{-s} < \xi >^s}{(1 + |\eta|^2)^{n+3}} \leq C_{n,\beta} \frac{< \xi - \eta >^{-s} < \xi >^s}{(1 + |\eta|^2)^{n+3}}$$

Using this fact and Peetre inequality one sees that $b(x,\xi;h)$ satisfies for all multi-indices α,β,

$$p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(b) \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\leq n+3+|\alpha|+|\beta|} p^{\sigma}_{\alpha',\beta'}(a)$$

$\square$
We now derive some weighted space estimates for operators of class $Op_hS^0_\sigma$

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $a \in S^0_\sigma$ *with* $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2$*. Then* $Op_h(a)$ *is bounded* $L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta$ *for all* $|\delta| \leq 2$*. Furthermore, there exists a constant* C *depending on dimension only such that*

$$\|Op_h(a)\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \leq C \sum_{\alpha,\beta \leq k(n)+2n+4} p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(a)$$

for all $|\delta| \leq 2$*,* $0 < h \leq 1$*.*

Proof
If $\delta = -2$, define $Tf(x) =< x >^{-2} A(< x >^2 f)$. For $f \in \mathcal{S}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(x) &= (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{ix\cdot\xi} a(x,h\xi) < x >^{-2} (I - \Delta_\xi)\hat{f}(\xi) d\xi \\ &= (2\pi)^{-n} \int (I - \Delta_\xi)(e^{ix\cdot\xi} a(x,h\xi) < x >^{-2})\hat{f}(\xi) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that T is a semi-classical ΨDO with symbol $a'(x,\xi;h) \in S^0_\sigma$ and semi-norms of $a'(x,\xi;h)$ are bounded by

$$p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(a') \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\leq|\alpha|+|\beta|+2} p^{\sigma}_{\alpha',\beta'}(a)$$

Use the above semi-norm estimate and apply proposition 3.1 to a' we get the desired estimate for $\delta = -2$. To get the estimate for $Op_h(a)$ acting on L^2_2, we consider its adjoint $Op_h(a)^*$ acting on L^2_{-2}. Lemma 3.2 shows that $Op_h(a)^* = Op_h(a^*)$ with $a^* \in S^0_\sigma$ satisfying

$$p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(a^*) \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\leq|\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+2} p_{\alpha',\beta'}(a)$$

Apply the result we already have for $\delta = -2$ to $Op_h(a^*) = Op_h(a)^*$ acting on L^2_{-2} in conjunction with the above estimate we get

$$\|Op_h(a)^*\|_{L^2_{-2} \to L^2_{-2}} \leq C \sum_{\alpha,\beta \leq k(n)+2n+4} p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(a)$$

Now an argument using the duality between L^2_2 and L^2_{-2} gives the estimate for $\delta = 2$. Using interpolation we get the estimate for all $\delta \in [-2,2]$ $\square$
Using this lemma along with lemma 3.3 one can even obtain estimates for operators acting on weighted semi-classical sobolev spaces (see for example [9]).

Lemma 3.5 *Let* $a \in S^0_\sigma$ *with* $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2$*. Then* $Op_h(a)$ *is bounded* $H^s_{\delta,h} \to H^s_{\delta,h}$ *for all* $|\delta| \leq 2$*. Furthermore, there exists a constant* C *such that*

$$\|Op_h(a)\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \leq C \sum_{\alpha,\beta \leq k(n)+2n+4} p^{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}(a)$$

for all $|\delta| \leq 2$*,* $|s| \leq 2$ $0 < h \leq 1$*.*

Proof
By lemma 3.3, the semi-norms for the symbol of $< hD >^s A < hD >^{-s}$ can be bounded by semi-norms of a. So apply lemma 3.4 to the $Op_h(S^0_\sigma)$ operator $< hD >^s A < hD >^{-s}$ we get

$$\| < x >^\delta < hD >^s Af\|_{L^2} \le C\| < x >^\delta < hD >^s f\|_{L^2} \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) \tag{4}$$

As shown in [9], there exists a constant depending on dimension only such that the following inequality holds for all $f \in \mathcal{S}$ and $|\delta| \le 2$

$$\| < hD >^2 < x >^\delta f\|_{L^2} \le C\| < x >^\delta < hD >^2 f\|_{L^2}$$

Apply this inequality to Af combined with (4) we get as in [9]

$$\begin{aligned} \| < hD >^2 < x >^\delta f\|_{L^2} &\le C(\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a))(\| < x >^\delta < hD >^2 f\|_{L^2}) \\ &\le C(\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a))(\sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} \| < x >^\delta (hD)^\alpha f\|_{L^2}) \\ &\le C(\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a))(\sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} \|(hD)^\alpha(< x >^\delta f)\|_{L^2}) \\ &\le C(\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a))(\| < hD >^2 < x >^\delta f\|_{L^2}) \end{aligned}$$

So we have proven the inequality for the case $s = 0, 2$. Moving to the Fourier side we see that this is equivalent to having for all $f \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfy

$$\| < h\xi >^2 < D_\xi >^\delta \hat{A} < D_\xi >^{-\delta} f\|_{L^2} \le C\{\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)\}\| < h\xi >^2 f\|_{L^2}$$

$$\| < D_\xi >^\delta \hat{A} < D_\xi >^{-\delta} f\|_{L^2} \le C\{\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le k(n)+3n+7} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)\}\|f\|_{L^2}$$

where $\hat{A}g := \widehat{A\check{g}}$. Interpolate the norm of the operator $< D_\xi >^\delta \hat{A} < D_\xi >^{-\delta}$ between the weighted spaces $< h\xi >^2$ and $< h\xi >^0$ gives the desired result for all $s \in [0, 2]$. The case of $s \in [-2, 0]$ can be done by similar duality argument used in the previous lemma. □

Suppose that $a \in S^0_\sigma$ satisfies $1/a \in S^0_\sigma$. It is well known that operators $Op_h(a)$ associated to such symbols are invertible provided $h > 0$ is taken to be smaller than some $h_0 > 0$ with h_0 depending on the chosen symbol. The next lemma addresses the question of when the h_0 can be taken uniformly for a given family of such symbols. More precisely

Lemma 3.6 *For all $M > 0$ and $\sigma < \frac{1}{2n+4}$ there exists an $h_0 > 0$ such that for all symbols $a \in S^0_\sigma$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le 4n+8+k(n)} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) \le M \qquad \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le 4n+8+k(n)} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(\frac{1}{a}) \le M$$

$Op_h(a)$ is invertible on L^2_δ for all $|\delta| \le 2$ and $0 < h \le h_0$. Furthermore the norm of the inverse is uniformly bounded

$$\|Op_h(a)^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \le C(M)$$

here $C(M)$ depends only on M and the dimension.

Proof
By lemma 3.1 $Op_h(a)Op_h(1/a) = I + h^{1-(2n+4)\sigma}Op_h(m)$ with $m(x,\xi;h) \in S^0_\sigma$ satisfying the semi-norm estimates

$$p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(m) \le C_{\alpha,\sigma}\Big(\sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\le|\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+4} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(a) + \sum_{|\alpha'|,|\beta'|\le|\alpha|+|\beta|+2n+4} p^\sigma_{\alpha',\beta'}(a^{-1})\Big)$$

Combining this and the weighted space estimates of lemma 3.4 we get

$$\|Op_h(m)\|_{L^2_\delta\to L^2_\delta} \le C \sum_{\alpha,\beta\le 4n+8+k(n)} (p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) + p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(b)) \le CM$$

for all $|\delta| \le 2$. Since $\sigma < \frac{1}{2n+4}$, we can pick $h_0 > 0$ such that $h_0^{1-(2n+4)\sigma}CM \le 1/2$. With this choice one sees that for all $0 < h \le h_0$, $(I + h^{1-(2n+4)\sigma}Op_h(m))$ is invertible with

$$\|(I + h^{1-(2n+4)\sigma}Op_h(m))^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta\to L^2_\delta} \le 2$$

for all $|\delta| \le 2$. So $Op_h(a)$ has a right inverse for $h \le h_0$ that has norm bounded by $C(M)$. The exact same argument applied to $Op_h(1/a)Op_h(a)$ implies the existence of a left inverse of $Op_h(a)$ with norm bounded by $C(M)$. So there exists an $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ depending on dimension and M only such that $Op_h(a)$ is bounded invertible from $L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta$ with norm $\|Op_h(a)^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta\to L^2_\delta} \le CM$ for all $|\delta| \le 2$ and $h \le h_0$. $\square$

4 Properties of Complex Geometric Optic Solutions for Magnetic Schrödinger Equation

Given an $M > 0$, $R > 0$ $p > n$ consider the family compactly supported vector fields

$$\mathcal{W}(M,R) := \{W \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \|W\|_{W^{1,p}} \le M, \|divW\|_{L^\infty} \le M \ and \ supp(W) \subset B_R\}$$

and the family of compactly supported electric potentials

$$\mathcal{Q}(M,R) := \{q \in L^\infty \mid \|q\|_{L^\infty} \le M, supp(q) \subset B_R\}$$

In this section we show that the CGO solutions to the equation $H_{W,q}u = 0$ has remainder decaying uniformly for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$, $q \in \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$. More precisely,

Proposition 4.1 *Let σ_0, θ be positive numbers satisfying $\sigma_0 + \theta < \frac{1}{4n+6}$. For all $M > 0$ and $R > 0$ there exists constants $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$ depending on dimension, p, σ_0, θ, M and R only such that for all $(W,q) \in \mathcal{W}(M,R) \times \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\zeta\cdot\zeta = 0$ and $|\zeta| \ge \frac{1}{h_0}$, there exists solutions to $H_{W,q}u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the form*

$$u(x,\zeta) = e^{i\zeta\cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi^\sharp} + r(x,|\zeta|)), \qquad \|r(\cdot,|\zeta|)\|_{H^t_\delta} \le C|\zeta|^{t-\epsilon}, \qquad t \in [0,2]$$

where $\varphi^\sharp$ is defined by

$$\varphi^\sharp(x) = \frac{-\sqrt{2}\zeta}{2\pi|\zeta|} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{W^\sharp(x - y_1\frac{\sqrt{2}Re(\zeta)}{|\zeta|} - y_2\frac{\sqrt{2}Im(\zeta)}{|\zeta|})}{y_1 + iy_2}$$

Here $\chi_{|\zeta|} = \chi(x/|\zeta|^{\theta})$ *with* $\chi(x)$ *being a smooth function supported in the unit ball and is* 1 *near zero,* $W^{\sharp}$ *is the convolution of* W *with the mollifier defined by*

$$W^{\sharp}(x) = \int |\zeta|^{n\sigma_0}\chi(y|\zeta|^{\sigma_0})W(x-y)dy$$

The next subsection proves some facts about the particular semi-classical symbols that we will be working with.

4.1 Semi-Classical Symbols Arising from Magnetic Field

In this section we define some symbols and prove some estimates for their semi-norms. For the motivation of these definitions see [9]. If $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfies $\zeta \cdot \zeta = 0$, then we have $\zeta = \mu/h$ with $h = \sqrt{2}/|\zeta|$ and $\mu = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$ where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are unit vectors satisfying $\gamma_1 \perp \gamma_2$. Let σ_0 and σ be positive number satisfying $0 < \sigma_0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4n+6}$ and define $\theta = \sigma - \sigma_0$. For a given compactly supported magnetic potential $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$ we decompose $W = W^{\sharp} + W^{\flat}$ where

$$W^{\sharp}(x) = \int \frac{1}{h^{n\sigma_0}}\chi(\frac{y}{h^{\sigma_0}})W(x-y)dy$$

With these notations we define the nonsmooth symbol $r(x,\xi) = W(x)\cdot(\xi+\mu)$ and its smooth approximation $r^{\sharp} = W^{\sharp}(x)\cdot(\xi+\mu)$. Notice now that with this definition,

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha} r^{\sharp}(x,\xi)| \le C_{\alpha}\|W\|_{L^{\infty}} h^{-|\alpha|\sigma_0}(|\xi|+1) \le C_{\alpha} M h^{-|\alpha|\sigma_0}(|\xi|+1)$$

Finally we define the elliptic symbol $q(\xi) = (\xi+\gamma_1)^2 - 1 + 2i\gamma_2\cdot\xi$.
For $\epsilon > 0$ we will consider the neighbourhood

$$U(\epsilon) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 1-\epsilon < |\xi+\gamma_1| < 1+\epsilon, |\xi\cdot\gamma_2| < \epsilon\}$$

and introduce a smooth cutoff ψ with $\psi = 1$ in $U(\epsilon/4)$ and $\psi = 0$ outside of $U(\epsilon/2)$. Define the function

$$w(x,\xi) := \frac{-1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{y_1+iy_2}\psi(\xi) r^{\sharp}(x - y_1(\xi+\gamma_1) - y_2\gamma_2, \xi)dy_1 dy_2 \tag{5}$$

Then by lemma 2.2 it is a C^{∞} function that solves

$$(\xi+\mu)\cdot\nabla_x w = -\psi(\xi) r^{\sharp}(x,\xi)$$

and satisfies the estimates

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha}\partial_{\xi}^{\beta} w(x,\xi;h)| \le C_{\alpha,\beta,R} M h^{-\sigma_0|\alpha+\beta|} < x >^{|\beta|-1} \tag{6}$$

We see here that $w(x,\xi;h)$ is not quite a symbol of class $S^0_{\sigma_0}$ since it has growth in x if we take more than 1 derivatives in ξ. To remedy this problem we will introduce another cutoff this time in the x variable. Let χ be a compactly supported smooth function that is identically 1 in B_R and define

$$\varphi(x,\xi) = \chi(h^{\theta}x)w(x,\xi)$$

where $\theta = \sigma - \sigma_0$. With θ chosen this way (6) shows that φ satisfies

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha}\partial_{\xi}^{\beta}\varphi(x,\xi)| \le C_{\alpha,\beta,R} M < x >^{-1} h^{-\sigma|\alpha+\beta|} \tag{7}$$

Therefore φ and $< x > \varphi$ are in S^0_σ with semi-norms $p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(\varphi)$ and $p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(< x > \varphi)$, bounded above by $C_{\alpha,\beta,R}M$. Furthermore if we define symbols a, b by

$$a = e^{i\varphi} \quad b = a + 2h\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp \tag{8}$$

then a and b are in S^0_σ with semi-norm estimate

$$p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(b) + p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) \le C_{\alpha,\beta,R}Me^M \tag{9}$$

Note that although the notation does not explicitly state the dependence of a and b on the given magnetic field W, we must keep in mind that there is indeed a nontrivial dependence. The following lemma states a "uniform invertibility" result for $Op_h(a)$ and $Op_h(b)$.

Lemma 4.1 *There exists an $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$, the symbol $a(x,\xi;h)$ arising from W as in (8) has invertible semiclassical quantization $Op_h(a)$ for all $h \le h_0$. More precisely, for all $h \le h_0$, $Op_h(a)$ is invertible from $L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta$ with norm*

$$\|Op_h(a)^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \le C_R M e^M$$

for all $|\delta| \le 2$. The same holds for $b(x,\xi;h) = a(x,\xi;h) + 2h\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp$.

Proof

Observe that $1/a = e^{-i\varphi}$ so it satisfies the same semi-norm estimates as a. So by (9) there exists an M' such that all symbols a arising from some $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$ satisfies

$$\sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le 4n+8+k(n)} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a) \le M' \qquad \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta| \le 4n+8+k(n)} p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(\frac{1}{a}) \le M'$$

Lemma 3.6 then gives an $h_0 > 0$ such that all quantizations $Op_h(a) : L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta$ are invertible as long as $h \le h_0$. Furthermore the norm of the inverse is bounded by

$$\|Op_h(a)^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \le 2M'$$

for all $|\delta| \le 2$. Moving on to b, observe that

$$Op_h(b) = Op_h(a) + 2hOp_h(\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp)$$

Obviously, $\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp \in S^0_\sigma$ with

$$p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp) \le C_{\alpha,\beta,R}Me^M$$

for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$. Therefore, by lemma 3.4 there exists a constant (WLOG) M' such that

$$\|Op_h(\frac{1-\psi(\xi)}{q(\xi)}e^{i\varphi}r^\sharp\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \le M'$$

for all $h > 0$, $|\delta| \le 2$ and $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$. Choose $h_0 > 0$ such that $2h_0M'^2 \le \frac{1}{2}$ and a simple argument involving Neumann series shows that $Op_h(b)$ is invertible from $L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta$ with norm

$$\|Op_h(b)^{-1}\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_\delta} \le 4M'$$

for all $h \leq h_0$ and $|\delta| \leq 2$. $\square$

We conclude this subsection by introducing two other operators which will be key in the construction of CGO. Consider the symbol

$$h^{1+\theta}\{2e^{i\varphi}[(\xi+\mu)\cdot w\nabla\chi(h^\theta x)]\} + h^{2-2\sigma}\{h^{2\sigma}[\Delta_x a + 2W^\sharp \cdot D_x a]\}$$

Due to estimate (7) and the fact that the $w(x,\xi) = 0$ for $|\xi| \geq 1$, if we take $\epsilon = min\{\theta, 1-2\sigma\}$ this symbol can be written as $h^{1+\epsilon}r_0$ with $r_0 \in S^0_\sigma$ and $< x > r_0 \in S^0_\sigma$. It can easily be checked from the definition that $p^\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(< x > r_0) \leq C_{\alpha,\beta,R}Me^M$ for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(R,M)$. Therefore, by lemma 3.4 this implies that

$$\|Op_h(r_0)\|_{L^2_\delta \to L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq CMe^M \quad \textit{for all} \quad |\delta| \leq 2 \tag{10}$$

Now consider the operator T and its inverse

$$T = B\Delta_\zeta A^{-1}\Delta_\zeta^{-1}, \quad T^{-1} = \Delta_\zeta A \Delta_\zeta^{-1} B^{-1}$$

By [9] they can be written as

$$T = I + 2W^\sharp \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} - h^{-1+\epsilon}Op_h(r_0)A^{-1}\Delta_\zeta^{-1}$$

$$T^{-1} = I - 2W^\sharp \cdot D_\zeta A\Delta_\zeta^{-1}B^{-1} + h^{-1+\epsilon}Op_h(r_0)\Delta_\zeta^{-1}B^{-1}$$

It is now easy to see by analyzing the operators term by term that they are both bounded operators from $L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$ with norm depending only on M. For example, lets take

$$2W^\sharp \cdot D_\zeta A\Delta_\zeta^{-1}B^{-1} : L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$$

By lemma 4.1 the operator $B^{-1} : L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$ with norm CMe^M. Classical results for the Δ_ζ^{-1} operator shows that $\Delta_\zeta^{-1} : L^2_{\delta+1} \to H^1_{\delta,|\zeta|^{-1}}$ with norm less than $C|\zeta|^{-1}$ with C depending only on δ and the dimension. Lemma 3.5 combined with inequality (9) shows that $A : H^1_{\delta,|\zeta|^{-1}} \to H^1_{\delta,|\zeta|^{-1}}$ with norm CMe^M. Since $W^\sharp$ is compactly supported with support independent of ζ, $W^\sharp \cdot D_\zeta$: $H^1_{\delta,|\zeta|^{-1}} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$ with norm less than $M|\zeta|$. So we see that $2W^\sharp \cdot D_\zeta A\Delta_\zeta^{-1}B^{-1} : L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$ with norm at most CMe^M with C depending on dimension and δ only. The rest of the terms can be handled in a similar way to give that

$$\|T\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}\to L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq CMe^M \quad \|T^{-1}\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}\to L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq CMe^M \tag{11}$$

for $-1 < \delta < 0$.

4.2 Invertibility of the $(\Delta_\zeta + 2W \cdot D_\zeta + q)$ Operator

In this section we prove the following theorem which plays a critical role in the construction of CGO solutions

Proposition 4.2 *Fix $\delta \in (-1,0)$. For all $M > 0$, $R > 0$ there exists an $C > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $W \in \mathcal{W}(M,R)$, $q \in \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$, and $f \in L^2_{\delta+1}$ the equation*

$$(\Delta_\zeta + 2W \cdot D_\zeta + q)u = f$$

has a unique solution $u \in H^1_\delta$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\zeta \cdot \zeta = 0$ and $|\zeta| \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$. Furthermore the following estimates holds for u with constants depending only on M and R but not on the choice of $(W,q) \in \mathcal{W}(M,R) \times \mathcal{Q}(M,R)$:

$$\|u\|_{H^t_\delta} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}}|\zeta|^{t-1} \qquad t \in [0,2]$$

Proof
As in [9] we seek solutions in the form of $u = \Delta_\zeta^{-1} v$. Following [9] we see that v satisfies

$$(I + h^{-1+\epsilon} Op_h(r_0) A^{-1} \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + 2W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + q \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1}) T v = f$$

First we will show the invertibility of the operator

$$(I + h^{-1+\epsilon} Op_h(r_0) A^{-1} \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + 2W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + q \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1})$$

from $L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$. By (10), (11), and lemma 4.1, there exists an $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_0$,

$$\| h^{-1+\epsilon} Op_h(r_0) A^{-1} \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} \|_{L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq C h^\epsilon$$

with C depending only on M. To obtain the same result for $W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1}$, we observe that $W \in W^{1,p}_c(B_R; \mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow C^{0,1-n/p}_c(B_R; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\|W\|_{C^{0,1-n/p}(B_R;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|W\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R;\mathbb{R}^n)}$ so that $\|W^\flat\|_{L^\infty} \leq C M h^{1-n/p}$. Therefore

$$\| W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} \|_{L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq C h^{1-n/p}$$

The next term can be handled easily by using the same analysis and the fact that $supp(q) \subset B_R$. So by a Neumann series argument we see that there exists an $h_1 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_1$ the operator

$$(I + h^{-1+\epsilon} Op_h(r_0) A^{-1} \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + 2W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + q \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1})$$

is invertible from $L^2_{\delta+1} \to L^2_{\delta+1}$ with norm of inverse less than 2. Due to (11), T is invertible with norm of the inverse bounded by a constant depending only on M. Therefore we can write

$$v = T^{-1} (I + h^{-1+\epsilon} Op_h(r_0) A^{-1} \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + 2W^\flat \cdot D_\zeta \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1} + q \Delta_\zeta^{-1} T^{-1})^{-1} f$$

with the estimate $\|v\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}}$. The result now follows by writing $u = \Delta_\zeta^{-1} v$ and use the estimate we have for the operator Δ_ζ^{-1}.$\square$

4.3 Proof of Proposition 4.1

We prove theorem 4.1 in this subsection. The proof is identical to that which appeared in [9] and [8] except that we have to check that the decay of the remainder term is uniform for all $(W, q) \in \mathcal{W}(M, R) \times \mathcal{Q}(M, R)$. Plug $u = e^{i\zeta \cdot x}(e^{i\varphi^\sharp} + r)$ into $H_{W,q} u$ we see that $r(x, |\zeta|)$ satisfies

$$(\Delta_\zeta + 2W \cdot D_\zeta + G) r = -f \tag{12}$$

where $G = W^2 + D \cdot W + q \in L^\infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f = (\Delta_\zeta + 2W \cdot D_\zeta + G) e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi^\sharp} = e^{i\chi_{|\zeta|}\varphi^\sharp} \big[& i\chi_{|\zeta|} \Delta \varphi^\sharp + 2i D\chi_{|\zeta|} \cdot D\varphi^\sharp + i\varphi^\sharp \Delta \chi_{|\zeta|} \\ & (\chi_{|\zeta|} \nabla \varphi^\sharp + \varphi^\sharp \nabla \chi_{|\zeta|})^2 + 2\zeta \cdot (\nabla \chi_{|\zeta|}) \varphi^\sharp + 2\zeta \cdot (\nabla \varphi^\sharp) \chi_{|\zeta|} \\ & + 2W \cdot (\nabla \chi_{|\zeta|}) \varphi^\sharp + 2W \cdot (\nabla \varphi^\sharp) \chi_{|\zeta|} + 2W^\sharp \cdot \zeta + 2W^\flat \cdot \zeta + G \big] \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of $\varphi^\sharp$ it solves the transport equation

$$2\zeta \cdot \nabla \varphi^\sharp + 2W^\sharp \cdot \zeta = 0$$

Since for ζ large $W^\sharp = \chi_\zeta W^\sharp$ the above relation removes the two terms that is of order $|\zeta|$ from f. So in terms of $L^2_{\delta+1}$ norms this is

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\| \;&\leq\; C\big[||i\chi_{|\zeta|}\Delta\varphi^\sharp|| + ||\nabla\chi_{|\zeta|}\cdot\nabla\varphi^\sharp|| + ||\varphi^\sharp\Delta\chi_{|\zeta|}|| + |||\chi_{|\zeta|}\nabla\varphi^\sharp|^2|| + |||\varphi^\sharp\nabla\chi_{|\zeta|}|^2|| \\ &+\; |\zeta|^{1-\theta}||\varphi^\sharp\nabla\chi(x|\zeta|^{-\theta})|| + ||W\cdot(\nabla\chi_{|\zeta|})\varphi^\sharp|| + ||W\cdot(\nabla\varphi^\sharp)\chi_{|\zeta|}|| \\ &+\; |\zeta|||W^\flat|| + ||G||\big] \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Every term except for $|\zeta|||W^\flat||$ in the above expression are of order $C|\zeta|^{1-\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ by our choice of δ, σ, θ and lemma 2.1 (see [9] for details). Assuming without loss of generality that $\epsilon \leq 1 - n/p$, Sobolev embedding gives $W \in C^{0,\epsilon}_c(B_R)$ with $\|W\|_{C^{0,\epsilon}(B_R)} \leq M$. So by property of the mollifier we have that $\|W^\flat\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq C|\zeta|^{-\epsilon\theta}$ with C depending only on M and R. Therefore we conclude that

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{\delta+1}} \leq C|\zeta|^{1-\epsilon}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Apply lemma 4.2 to the operator $(\Delta_\zeta + 2W\cdot D_\zeta + G)$ gives a $C > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $|\zeta| \geq 1/h_0$ and $\zeta\cdot\zeta = 0$ equation (12) has a unique solution satisfying

$$\|r\|_{H^t_\delta} \leq C|\zeta|^{t-\epsilon}, \quad t \in [0,2]$$

and the proof is complete.□

PART II - Full Data Estimate

5 Estimate for the Magnetic Field

We wish to derive log-type estimates for the curl of the difference of the magnetic potential $W_1 - W_2$. The main result of this section is

Theorem 5.1 *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. For all $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$\|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$ ($l = 1,2$) and $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Here $I_\Omega(x)$ is the indicator function of Ω.

Before we proceed with the proof of theorem 5.1, we will see that the $W_1 |_{\partial\Omega} = W_2 |_{\partial\Omega}$ condition can be slightly relaxed provided we assume more regularity about the magnetic potentials. The only reason we need to make the additional assumption is to ensure that the gauge transformation one needs to do to reduce to the case of theorem 5.1 has sufficient regularity. Sharper results with less a-priori assumptions are possible but the technical details would obscure the main points of this exposition.

Corollary 5.2 *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. For all $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$\|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$ ($l = 1,2$) and $W_1 |_D = W_2 |_D$ on $\partial\Omega$. Here $I_\Omega(x)$ is the indicator function of Ω.

Proof
Suppose the statement is proven in the case when $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then for arbitrary W_1, W_2 such that $W_1 \mid_D = W_2 \mid_D$ and $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, one can construct potentials $p_1, p_2 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\|p_l\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq CM, \quad \frac{\partial p_l}{\partial \nu} = -W_l \mid_N$$

where C depends on Ω only. Then $\|W_l + \nabla p_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq CM$ with

$$W_1 + \nabla p_1 = W_2 + \nabla p_2 \quad on \quad \partial\Omega$$

Apply theorem 5.1 and use the gauge invariance property of both the DN map and the d operator we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|I_\Omega d((W_1 - \nabla p_1) - (W_2 - \nabla p_2))\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\
&\leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1-\nabla p_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2-\nabla p_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1-\nabla p_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2-\nabla p_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\} \\
&\leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.1 Extending Vector Fields to a Larger Domain

First we need to prove a technical lemma about extending a $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ vector field to a slightly larger domain

Lemma 5.3 *Let $\Omega \subset\subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Suppose $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $u' \in W^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega)$ and $u = u'$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then the function defined by*

$$U(x) := \begin{Bmatrix} u(x) & x \in \Omega \\ u'(x) & x \in \tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega \end{Bmatrix}$$

is in $W^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega})$ and

$$\partial_j U(x) = \begin{Bmatrix} \partial_j u(x) & x \in \Omega \\ \partial_j u'(x) & x \in \tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega \end{Bmatrix}$$

Furthermore, $\|U\|_{W^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega})} = \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u'\|_{W^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega)}$

Proof Integrate by parts and check that the definition of weak derivative holds.□

Lemma 5.4 *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is compactly contained in $\tilde{\Omega}$. Suppose $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that for $l = 1, 2$ $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$ and $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then there exists extentions $\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \in W^{1,\infty}_c(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that*

$$\|\tilde{W}_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C(\tilde{\Omega}, \Omega)M$$

and $W_1 = W_2$ on $\tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega$. Here the constant depends only on Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ but not on M.

Proof

By standard extention theorem, there exists a $\tilde{W}_1 \in W_c^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that $\|W_1\|_{W_c^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C\|W_1\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$.
For $\tilde{W}_2$ we define

$$\tilde{W}_2 := \begin{Bmatrix} W_2 & x \in \Omega \\ \tilde{W}_1 & x \in \tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega \end{Bmatrix}$$

Since $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$, by lemma 5.3 we have $\tilde{W}_2 \in W_c^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})$ with $\|\tilde{W}_2\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq CM$ and

$$\partial_j \tilde{W}_2 = \begin{Bmatrix} \partial_j W_2 & x \in \Omega \\ \partial_j \tilde{W}_1 & x \in \tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega \end{Bmatrix}$$

Therefore we have that $\tilde{W}_2 \in W_c^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})$ and $\|W_2\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq CM\Box$

5.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Fix $j, k \in \{1...n\}$. For all ξ such that $\xi_j \neq 0$ or $\xi_k \neq 0$, define $\tilde{\gamma} := \frac{e_j\xi_k - e_k\xi_j}{|e_j\xi_k - e_k\xi_j|}$.
Choose $\gamma \perp \tilde{\gamma}$, $\tilde{\gamma} \perp \xi$, $|\gamma| = 1$ and define $\mu = \gamma + i\tilde{\gamma}$. For each $s \geq |\xi|$ let

$$\zeta_1(s) = \zeta_1 = -is\tilde{\gamma} + g(\xi, s)\gamma + \xi$$

$$\zeta_2(s) = \zeta_2 = is\tilde{\gamma} + g(\xi, s)\gamma - \xi$$

where $g(\xi, s) = \sqrt{s^2 - |\xi|^2}$. Note that $\zeta_l(s)$ can be written as $\zeta_l(s) = (-1)^l is\tilde{\gamma} + s\gamma_l'$ $(l = 1, 2)$ provided we take

$$\gamma_1' = \frac{g(\xi, s)\gamma + \xi}{s}, \quad \gamma_2' = \frac{g(\xi, s)\gamma - \xi}{s}$$

Let $\sigma_0 > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ be chosen so that $0 < \sigma_0 < \sigma_0 + \theta < \frac{1}{4n+6}$. Given any $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, extend them to compactly supported vector fields $\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \in W_c^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ as described in lemma 5.4 of the previous section. Therefore, there exists an $M' > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that $\tilde{W}_l \in \mathcal{W}(M', R)$ whenever $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$. Proposition 4.1 then gives a $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, and $0 < \epsilon < \sigma_0(1 - \frac{n}{p})$ such that for all $|\zeta_l| \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ there exists solutions $u_l(x, \zeta_l)$ to $H_{\tilde{W}_l, q_l} u_l = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that are of the form:

$$u_l(x, \zeta_l) = e^{i\zeta_l \cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta_l|}\varphi_l^\sharp} + r_l(x, \zeta_l)) \quad \|r_l(\cdot, \zeta_l)\|_{H_\delta^t} \leq C|\zeta_l|^{t-\epsilon} \quad t \in [0, 2] \quad -1 < \delta < 0$$

$$\varphi_l^\sharp(x) = -\frac{\gamma_l' + (-1)^l i\tilde{\gamma}}{2\pi} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\tilde{W}_l^\sharp(x - \gamma_l' y_1 - (-1)^l \tilde{\gamma} y_2)}{y_1 + iy_2}$$

where $\chi_{|\zeta_l|} = \chi(x/|\zeta_l|^\theta)$ and $\tilde{W}_l^\sharp = \int |\zeta_l|^{n\sigma_0}\chi(y|\zeta_l|^{\sigma_0})\tilde{W}_l(x - y)dy$
Note here that C, h_0, and ϵ depend on dimension, Ω, θ, σ_0 and M only but not on the choice of (W_l, q_l) as long as $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$ and $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty} \leq M$. All constants in this section will have only the aforementioned dependence. In fact, the only reason we need the a-priori bound to be on the $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ norm is so that the extention $\tilde{W}_l$ would have $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ divergence which is required for the construction of CGO by proposition 4.1. After the solutions have been constructed we only need the a-priori estimate to be in the $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ norm for $p > n$. To demonstrate this fact we will only work with this norm in the proof below.

Lemma 5.5 *Let u_l be the solutions constructed above. For all $s \geq 1/h_0$ such that $\chi_s(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ we have*

$$\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot (u_1 \nabla \bar{u}_2 - \bar{u}_2 \nabla u_1) dx = -i \int_\Omega e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} e^{2i\xi \cdot x} (W_1 - W_2) \cdot (\bar{\zeta}_2 + \zeta_1) + f_1(x,s) + f_2(x,s) dx$$

with $\|f_1(x,s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|f_2(x,s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq Cs^{1-\epsilon}$

Proof
For all $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_2 \nabla u_1 &= \zeta_1 e^{2i\xi\cdot x} e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} + \zeta_1 e^{2i\xi \cdot x}\{r_1(x,s) e^{i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2(x,s) e^{i\bar{\varphi}_1^\sharp} + r_1 \bar{r}_2\} \\ &+ e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} \nabla \varphi_1^\sharp + i e^{i\varphi_1^\sharp} \bar{r}_2 \nabla \varphi_1^\sharp + e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} \nabla r_1 + \bar{r}_2 \nabla r_1\} \\ &= \zeta_1 e^{2i\xi\cdot x} e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} + T_1 + T_2 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where

$$T_1 := \zeta_1 e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{r_1(x,s) e^{i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2(x,s) e^{i\bar{\varphi}_1^\sharp} + r_1 \bar{r}_2\}$$

$$T_2 := e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} \nabla \varphi_1^\sharp + i e^{i\varphi_1^\sharp} \bar{r}_2 \nabla \varphi_1^\sharp + e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} \nabla r_1 + \bar{r}_2 \nabla r_1\}$$

Use lemma 2.1 and the fact that $\tilde{W}_l^\sharp$ $(l = 1,2)$ is compactly supported in $\tilde{\Omega}$

$$\|\varphi_l^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{W}_l^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq CM$$

Use the fact that $\|r_l\|_{L^2_\delta} \leq Cs^{-\epsilon}$, one easily shows that $\|T_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq Cs^{1-\epsilon}$. The next term T_2 can be handled in a similar fashion. The only problematic part of T_2 are the terms involving $\nabla \varphi_1^\sharp$. But by lemma 2.1 we have

$$\|\varphi_1^\sharp\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{W}_1^\sharp\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq Cs^{\sigma_0} \|\tilde{W}_1^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq Cs^{\sigma_0} \|\tilde{W}_1^\sharp\|_{W^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq CM' s^{\sigma_0} \leq CM' s^{1-\epsilon}$$

the last inequality comes from the fact that $\sigma_0 < \frac{1}{4n+6}$ and $\epsilon < \sigma_0(1 - \frac{n}{p})$. So arguing term by term in T_2 we get that $\|T_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq Cs^{1-\epsilon}$. Combining these observations into (14) we get that

$$\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot \bar{u}_2 \nabla u_1 = \int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot \zeta_1 e^{2i\xi\cdot x} e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} + \int_\Omega T_1 + \int_\Omega T_2$$

with the $L^1(\Omega)$ norm of T_1, T_2 controlled by $Cs^{1-\epsilon}$. Of course, similar calculation holds for the $u_1 \nabla \bar{u}_2$ and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 5.6

$$\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot (\bar{\zeta}_2 + \zeta_1) e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx = -\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx + G(\xi, s)$$

with $|G(\xi,s)| \leq C|s - g(\xi,s)| + s^{1-\epsilon} + s|\tilde{\gamma} - \frac{g(\xi,s)\tilde{\gamma} + \xi}{s}|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}$

Proof
By the definition of ζ_1, ζ_2 we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot (\bar{\zeta}_2 + \zeta_1) e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx &= -\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu} e^{i(\psi_1 - \bar{\psi}_2)} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu}(e^{i(\psi_1 - \bar{\psi}_2)} - e^{i(\psi_1^\sharp - \bar{\psi}_2^\sharp)}) e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu}(e^{i(\psi_1^\sharp - \bar{\psi}_2^\sharp)} - e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)}) e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot \gamma 2(s - g(\xi, s)) e^{i(\varphi_1^\sharp - \bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp)} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} \\ &:= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\psi_1 := N_{\bar{\mu}}^{-1}(-\bar{\mu} \cdot \tilde{W}_1)$, $\psi_2 := N_{\mu}^{-1}(-\mu \cdot \tilde{W}_2)$ and $\psi_1^\sharp, \psi_2^\sharp$ are defined the same way with $\tilde{W}_l^\sharp$ replacing $\tilde{W}_l$. A simple calculation shows that $\psi_1(x) - \bar{\psi}_2(x) = N_{\bar{\mu}}^{-1}(-\bar{\mu} \cdot (\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2))$. Recall that $\tilde{W}_1 = \tilde{W}_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \backslash \Omega$, so by lemma 2.6

$$T_1 = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu} e^{i(\psi_1 - \bar{\psi}_2)} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu} e^{2i\xi\cdot x} = -\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot 2s\bar{\mu} e^{2i\xi\cdot x}$$

Now it remains to estimate the three other terms. Applying lemma 2.5, 2.4, and 2.1 to T_2, T_3 and T_4 respectively, and use the fact that $W_c^{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})$ for $p > n$ we get that

$$|T_2| \le Cs(\|\tilde{W}_1\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_2\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})}) s^{-\sigma_0(1-\frac{n}{p})} \le Cs^{1-\epsilon}$$

$$|T_3| \le Cs(\|\tilde{W}_1\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_2\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})}) |\tilde{\gamma} - \frac{g(\xi, s)\tilde{\gamma} + \xi}{s}|^{1-\frac{n}{p}} \le Cs|\tilde{\gamma} - \frac{g(\xi, s)\tilde{\gamma} + \xi}{s}|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}$$

$$|T_4| \le Cs(\|\tilde{W}_1\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_2\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\tilde{\Omega})}) |1 - \frac{g(\xi, s)}{s}| \le Cs|1 - \frac{g(\xi, s)}{s}|$$

Substitute the identity for T_1 into equation(15) and set $G(\xi, s) := T_2 + T_3 + T_4$ we get the desired result.□

Proof of Theorem 5.1
By [11], any solution u_l of $H_{W_l,q_l} u_l = 0$ satisfies the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} &i\int_\Omega (W_1 - W_2) \cdot (u_1 \nabla \bar{u}_2 - \bar{u}_2 \nabla u_1) + (W_1^2 - W_2^2) u_1 \bar{u}_2 + (q_1 - q_2) u_1 \bar{u}_2 \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \bar{u}_2 (\Lambda_{W_2,q_2} - \Lambda_{W_1,q_1}) u_1 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Combining the result of lemmas 5.6 and 5.5 into this equation we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 2s\int_\Omega \bar{\mu} \cdot (W_1 - W_2) e^{2i\xi\cdot x} &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \bar{u}_2 (\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}) u_1 \\ &+ \int_\Omega (W_1^2 - W_2^2 + q_2 - q_1) \bar{u}_2 u_1 + f_1(x, s) + f_2(x, s) dx + G(\xi, s) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where f_1, f_2, and $G(\xi, s)$ are as in lemma 5.6 and 5.5. Observe that if we set

$$D := sup\{|x| \mid x \in \Omega\}$$

then $\|u_l\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{Ds}$ for s large. Furthermore, the $L^1(\Omega)$ norm of $|\bar{u}_2 u_1|$ is uniformly bounded independent of s and ξ. Apply lemma 5.5 and lemma 5.6 we conclude the following estimate for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $s > \frac{1}{h_0}$ such that $|\xi_k| + |\xi_j| > 0$ and $|\xi| \leq s$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_\Omega \bar{\mu} \cdot (W_1 - W_2) e^{2i\xi\cdot x}| &\leq C(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |1 - \frac{g(\xi,s)}{s}| + s^{-\epsilon} \\ &\quad + |\tilde{\gamma} - \frac{g(\xi,s)\tilde{\gamma} + \xi}{s}|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}) \\ &\leq C(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + (\frac{|\xi|}{s})^{1-n/p} + s^{-\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the inequality $\sqrt{1-t} \geq 1-t$ for $t \in [0,1]$. By the exact same method as above we can obtain the estimate for $-\mu$ in place of $\bar{\mu}$ to get

$$|\int_\Omega -\mu \cdot (W_1 - W_2) e^{2i\xi\cdot x}| \leq C(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + (\frac{|\xi|}{s})^{1-n/p} + s^{-\epsilon}$$

Recall that $\mu = \gamma + i\tilde{\gamma}$ with $\tilde{\gamma} = \frac{\xi_j e_k - \xi_k e_j}{|\xi_j e_k - \xi_k e_j|}$. Multiplying both estimates by $|\xi_j e_k - \xi_k e_j|$ then add them together we get that:

$$|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{\xi_j(W_1 - W_2)_k - \xi_k(W_1 - W_2)_j\}| \leq C|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + (\frac{|\xi|}{s})^{1-n/p} + s^{-\epsilon}) \quad (18)$$

Recall that since $(W_1 - W_2) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we can extend $(W_1 - W_2)$ to a $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ vector field by defining it to be zero outside of Ω and we will refer to the extention as $I_\Omega(W_1 - W_2)$. With this extention we have that $d(I_\Omega(W_1 - W_2))$ is an $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ function supported only in Ω and

$$d(I_\Omega(W_1 - W_2)) = I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)$$

as $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ functions. Therefore, (18) implies that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $|\xi_j| + |\xi_k| > 0$ and $s \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ such that $|\xi| \leq s$, the following inequality holds for the Fourier transform of each component of $I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)$

$$|\mathcal{F}(I_\Omega(\partial_j(W_1 - W_2)_k - \partial_k(W_1 - W_2)_j))(2\xi)| \leq C|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + (\frac{|\xi|}{s})^{1-n/p} + s^{-\epsilon})$$

By the fact that both the right and left side are continuous, the estimate holds for all ξ such that $|\xi| \leq s$. Since this is true for all components of the 2-form $I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)$ we have that for any $0 < R \leq s$, $s \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 &= \int_{|\xi|\leq R} \frac{|\mathcal{F}(I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2))|^2}{1+|\xi|^2} d\xi + \int_{|\xi|\geq R} \frac{|\mathcal{F}(I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2))|^2}{1+|\xi|^2} d\xi \\ &\leq CR^n(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}^2 + (\frac{R^2}{s^2})^{1-n/p} + s^{-2\epsilon}) + \frac{C}{R^2} \end{aligned}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{H^{-1}}$ denotes the norm on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the dual space of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the last inequality comes from our a-priori assumption on the $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ norm of W_l. Recall however that the above statement is only valid for s large enough to guarantee CGO solutions. Namely, the inequality holds only when $s \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ where $h_0 > 0$ depends only on Ω and M. But since the estimate is trivial in the case when

$$\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} \geq min\{1, e^{-2D/h_0}\}$$

(just take the constant large enough and use the a-priori assumptions on W_l), we may assume without loss of generality that $\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} < min\{1, e^{-2D/h_0}\}$. With this assumption we may choose $R^n = s^{min\{\epsilon, 1-n/p\}}$ and $s = \frac{-log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|}{2D}$ and we obtain that

$$\|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|^2_{H^{-1}} \leq \frac{C}{|log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^\epsilon} + C\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$, $C > 0$ depending on M and Ω.$\square$

Note here that we have obtained an estimate for the $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm of $I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)$ and not just the $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ norm of $d(W_1 - W_2)$. For clarity, we will refer to the dual space of $H^1_0(\Omega)$ as $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ and the dual space to $H^1(\Omega)$ as $H^1(\Omega)^*$. In general, the $H^1(\Omega)^*$ norm is larger than the $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ norm. It is easily seen from the estimate which we derived in theorem 5.1 and corollary 5.2 that in both cases we have

$$\|d(W_1 - W_2)\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)^*} \leq \frac{C}{|log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^\epsilon} + C\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} \tag{19}$$

This will be a key ingredient in proving the result of the next section.

6 Estimates for the Electric Potential

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition:

Theorem 6.1 *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. For all $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\{\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|^{1/2}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + |log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$ $(l = 1, 2)$ and $W_1 \mid_D = W_2 \mid_D$ on $\partial\Omega$.

The proof of theorem 6.1 involves using the stability result we already obtained for the magnetic field. In order to do this we first need to prove a lemma about the bounded invertibility of the operator d on the set of 1-forms. This of course, is not true in general since the operator always has a non-trivial null space. But we will see that it is indeed injective provided that we quotient out the exact forms. We will employ the following notations. We consider $(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$ to be a Riemanian manifold with boundary and denote by $F^k(\Omega)$ to be the the set of k-forms on Ω and $W^{p,m}F^k(\Omega)$ to be its $W^{m,p}$ closure. Set

$$\mathcal{E}^k(\Omega) := \{d\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^1_D F^{k-1}(\Omega)\}, \quad \mathcal{C}^k(\Omega) := \{d\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^1_N F^{k-1}(\Omega)\}$$

where $H^1_D F^k(\Omega)$ and $H^1_N F^k(\Omega)$ are the set of H^1 k-forms with homogenous Dirichlet and Neumann boundary trace, respectively. Furthermore we denote by $\mathcal{H}^k(\Omega)$ to be the L^2 closure of the space of harmonic k-forms. The corresponding subspaces in $W^{p,m}F^k(\Omega)$ are denoted by

$$W^{m,p}\mathcal{E}^k(\Omega) := \mathcal{E}^k(\Omega) \cap W^{m,p}F^k(\Omega), \quad W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^k(\Omega) := \mathcal{C}^k(\Omega) \cap W^{m,p}F^k(\Omega)$$

$$and \quad W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^k(\Omega) := \mathcal{H}^k(\Omega) \cap W^{m,p}F^k(\Omega)$$

We will identify the space of 1-forms $W^{m,p}F^1(\Omega)$ with the space of vector fields $W^{m,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and the space of 0-forms $W^{m,p}F^0(\Omega)$ with the space of functions $W^{m,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set that is simply connected with connected boundary. For $p \geq 2$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$, define the set of Dirichlet 1- forms (or vector fields)*

$$W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) = \{W \in W^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n) \mid W(x) \cdot \hat{t} = 0 \ \forall \hat{t} \in T_x\partial\Omega, \ x \in \partial\Omega\}$$

and

$$X_0 = (W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \oplus W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$$

Then the differential $d : X_0 \to W^{m-1,p}\mathcal{E}^2(\Omega)$ has a bounded inverse.

Proof

Since $d : W^{m,p}F^k(\Omega) \to W^{m-1,p}F^{k+1}(\Omega)$ is a continuous linear operator we will use uniform boundedness principle to assert the existence of a bounded inverse. Since by [10], $W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega)$, $W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$, and $W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ are all closed subspaces of $W^{m,p}F^1(\Omega)$, it is clear that X_0 is a closed subspace of $W^{m,p}F^1(\Omega)$. Furthermore, $W^{m-1,p}\mathcal{E}^2(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace of $W^{m-1,p}F^2(\Omega)$ so it suffices to check the bijectivity of $d : X_0 \to W^{m-1,p}\mathcal{E}^2(\Omega)$ for the uniform boundedness principle to apply.

To see injectivity, suppose $dW = 0$ for some $W \in X_0$. By the fact that cohomology of Ω is assumed to be trivial, this means that $W = d\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in W^{m+1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$. Since W has no tangential component and $\partial\Omega$ is connected this means that α is a constant function along the boundary and we may take $\alpha \in W_D^{m+1,p}(\Omega)$. By definition this means that

$$W \in W^{m,p}\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) := \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) \cap W^{m,p}F^1(\Omega)$$

However, $W \in X_0 \subset W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \oplus W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ which is L^2 perpendicular to $W^{m,p}\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and thus $W = 0$. So this establishes injectivity.

To show surjectivity, let $\omega \in W^{m-1,p}\mathcal{E}^2(\Omega)$. Then by definition, $\omega = dW$ for some $W \in W_D^{1,2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. By the Hodge decomposition, we can decompose $\omega = dW_\omega + \delta\beta_\omega + \kappa_\omega$ with $W_\omega \in W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Subtract the two expressions we have for ω and use L^2 orthogonality again we see that

$$dW_\omega = dW = \omega$$

We now have that ω is in the range of the d operator acting on $W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ but it is not clear that $W_\omega \in X_0$. This can be remedied by applying the Hodge decomposition to W_ω to produce

$$W_\omega - d\alpha = \delta\eta + \kappa \quad \textit{with} \quad \alpha \in W_D^{m+1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}), \ \ \delta\eta \in W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega), \ \ \kappa \in W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \tag{20}$$

Since $\alpha \in W_D^{m+1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$, $d\alpha$ has no tangential component along the boundary. This with $W_\omega \in W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ shows that the LHS of (20) is in $W_D^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$. The RHS of (20) is clearly in $W^{m,p}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \oplus W^{m,p}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ so we conclude that $W_\omega - d\alpha \in X_0$. We now have

$$\omega = dW_\omega = d(W_\Omega - d\alpha) \ \ \textit{with} \ \ W_\Omega - d\alpha \in X_0$$

So surjectivity is established and uniform boundedness principle applies to give a bounded inverse.□

We would like to apply this lemma directly to the vector field $(W_1 - W_2)$ which may not be in X_0. So first we do the following manipulation. Pick $p > p_0 > n$ and apply the Hodge decomposition to $W_1 - W_2$ in the space $W^{2,p_0}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ to get $W_1 - W_2 = \delta\beta + d\alpha + \kappa$. By lemma 2.4.11 of [10], $\alpha \in W^{3,p_0}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ with norm $\|\alpha\|_{W^{3,p_0}(\Omega)} \leq C\|W_1 - W_2\|_{W^{2,p_0}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 2CM$ where the constant C depends on Ω and p_0 only. Define $W_1' := W_1 - \frac{d\alpha}{2}$ and $W_2' := W_2 + \frac{d\alpha}{2}$ so that $W_1' - W_2' \in W^{2,p_0}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \oplus W^{2,p_0}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$. Since we have already assumed that $W_1 - W_2$ has no tangential component at the boundary and $\alpha \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we conclude that $W_1' - W_2'$ has no tangential component. This means that

$$W_1' - W_2' \in (W^{1,p_0}\mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \oplus W^{1,p_0}\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H_D^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$$

so by lemma 6.2

$$\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{W^{1,p_0}(\Omega)} \leq C\|d(W_1' - W_2')\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} = C\|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \tag{21}$$

Recall that due to gauge invariance, we have $\Lambda_{W_l,q_l} = \Lambda_{W_l',q_l}$.
Choose a bounded open set $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that $\Omega \subset\subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Let E be the extension operator mapping $W^{1,p_0}(\Omega) \to W_c^{1,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega})$ and $W^{2,p_0}(\Omega) \to W_c^{2,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that it is bounded in both norms (see [3]). Denote by $\tilde{W}_l' := EW_l'$ for $(l = 1, 2)$. Note that the extention described here is different from the one we used in the previous section. For one thing we no longer have $\tilde{W}_1' = \tilde{W}_2'$ in $\tilde{\Omega}\backslash\Omega$. However, we still have that for each $M > 0$ there exists an $M' > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that if $\|W\|_{W^{2,p_0}(\Omega)} \leq M$ then $\tilde{W}' \in W_c^{2,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega})$ with $\|\tilde{W}'\|_{W^{2,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq M'$.
In this setting proposition 4.1 applied to $\tilde{W}_l'$ gives a $C > 0$, $(1 - \frac{n}{p_0})\sigma_0 > \epsilon > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that if $\zeta_l \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfies $\zeta_l \cdot \zeta_l = 0$, $|\zeta_l| \geq 1/h_0$ then for all W_l, q_l $(l = 1, 2)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,p_0}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$ and $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty} \leq M$ there exists solutions to $H_{\tilde{W}_l',q_l} u_l = 0$ of the form

$$u_l(x, \zeta_l) = e^{i\zeta_l \cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta_l|}\varphi_l^\sharp} + r_l(x, \zeta_l)) \quad \|r_l(\cdot, \zeta)\|_{H_\delta^t} \leq C|\zeta_l|^{t-\epsilon} \qquad t \in [0, 2] \quad -1 < \delta < 0$$

We emphasize again that the constants $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ depends as usual on the parameters and the a-priori bound M but not on the choice of (W_l, q_l) that satisfies the a-priori assumption.

Proof of Theorem 6.1

We start again with identity (16) except this time we will isolate the electric potential term on the LHS. Similar calculation to those done in lemma 5.5 shows that

$$\|u_1\bar{u}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \|u_1\nabla\bar{u}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}_2\nabla u_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq Cs$$

Use these estimates and the fact that $\|r_l(x, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Cs^{-\epsilon}$ identity (16), becomes

$$|\int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)e^{i\xi\cdot x}e^{i\varphi_1^\sharp - i\overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}}| \leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|W_1' - W_2'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}s + s^{-\epsilon})$$

Here again we use the fact that when s is large the CGO solutions satisfy $\|u_l(x, \zeta)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{sD}$ where $D := sup\{|x| \mid x \in \Omega\}$. Apply Morrey's inequality to $\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ then use (21) we get that

$$|\int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)e^{i\xi\cdot x}e^{i\varphi_1^\sharp - i\overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}}| \quad \leq \quad C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}s + s^{-\epsilon})$$

We want a Fourier transform to appear on the LHS. Therefore we replace $\int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)e^{i\xi\cdot x}e^{i\varphi_1^\sharp - i\overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}}$ by $\int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)e^{i\xi\cdot x}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{F}(q_1 - q_2)(2\xi)| \quad \leq \quad & C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)}s + s^{-\epsilon} \\ & + \|\varphi_1^\sharp - \overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

with all constants depending only on M.
Now we would like to estimate the last term by $\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{W^{1,p}}$. This can be done by writing

$$\|\varphi_1^\sharp - \overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\varphi_1^\sharp - \psi_1^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\varphi_2^\sharp} - \overline{\psi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_1^\sharp - \overline{\psi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \tag{23}$$

By our extention, $\tilde{W}_l' \in W_c^{2,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C_c^1(\tilde{\Omega})$. Therefore lemma 2.3 shows that the first two terms are bounded by $C\sqrt{(1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2})}$ with C depending only on the a-priori bound M. Due to lemma 2.1 the last term is bounded by

$$\|\psi_1^\sharp - \overline{\psi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\|\tilde{W}_1'^\sharp - \tilde{W}_2'^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C\|\tilde{W}_1' - \tilde{W}_2'\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_2'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_1'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}$$

Substitute this into (23) and use Morrey inequality we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi_1^\sharp - \overline{\varphi_2^\sharp}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq C\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}} + C\|\tilde{W}_1' - \tilde{W}_2'\|_{W^{1,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_2'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_1'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \\
&\leq C\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}} + C\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{W^{1,p_0}(\Omega)} + +\|\tilde{W}_2'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_1'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \\
&\leq C\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}} + C\|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} + +\|\tilde{W}_2'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{W}_1'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}
\end{aligned}$$

Use the fact that $\tilde{W}_l' \in W_c^{2,p_0}(\tilde{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C_c^1(\tilde{\Omega})$ again we see that $\|\tilde{W}_l'^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}$ vanishes like $Cs^{-\sigma_0}$ with C depending only on the a-priori bound M. Substitute this into the inequality (22) we get

$$|\mathcal{F}(q_1-q_2)(2\xi)| \leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)}s + s^{-\epsilon})$$

Recall that p_0 and p satisfy the condition $n < p_0 < p$ so we can interpolate

$$\|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \leq \|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{1-\lambda}\|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\lambda},\ \lambda = \frac{p_0^{-1}-p^{-1}}{2^{-1}-p^{-1}}$$

and use our a-priori assumption about the $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ norm of W_l we get that

$$|\mathcal{F}(q_1-q_2)(2\xi)| \leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\lambda}s + s^{-\epsilon}) \tag{24}$$

For any $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|f\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|f\|_{H^1(\Omega)^*}$. Apply this to each component of the 2-form $d(W_1 - W_2)$ and use our a-priori bound on $\|W_l\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)}$, (24) becomes

$$|\mathcal{F}(q_1-q_2)(2\xi)| \leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \|d(W_1-W_2)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^*}^{\lambda/2}s + s^{-\epsilon})$$

So by estimate (19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}(q_1-q_2)(2\xi)| \leq\ & C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \\
& \{|log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon} + \|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}\}^{\lambda/4}s + s^{-\epsilon})
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

and this is valid for all $s \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ and $s \geq |\xi|$. Computing directly the $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm of $q_1 - q_2$ by using Fourier transform, (25) implies that for $R > 0$, $s \geq max\{R, \frac{1}{h_0}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \leq R^nC \quad (\quad & e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} + \\
& \{|log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{-\epsilon} + \|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}\}^{\lambda/4}s + s^{-\epsilon}) + \frac{C}{R^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we can take $\epsilon < 1$ without loss of generality. Furthermore, as in the previous section we may assume that $\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}} \leq min\{e^{-(\frac{4D}{h_0})^{8/(\lambda\epsilon)}}, 1\}$ since the quantity $e^{-(\frac{4D}{h_0})^{8/(\lambda\epsilon)}}$ depends only on the a-priori bound M but not the chosen electric and magnetic potentials. Under these assumptions we may take $R^n = s^{\epsilon/2}$ and $s = \frac{1}{4D}|log\|\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2}\|_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{-1}{2}}|^{\epsilon/8} \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ and simple arithmetics establishes the lemma.□

PART III- Partial Data Estimate

7 Introduction

We now move on to the third part of the paper which addresses the stability problem when DN map is known only on part of the boundary. The estimates will be of *log log*-type and will be weaker than the one established in the full data case. For each $\tilde{\gamma} \in S^{n-1}$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ we define the front and back of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ with respect to $\tilde{\gamma}$ by

$$\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}) = \{x \in \partial\Omega \mid \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \nu(x) > \epsilon_0\} \quad \partial\Omega_{-,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}) = \partial\Omega \backslash \overline{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})}$$

Using this notation with fixed $\epsilon_0 > 0$, we define for any magnetic potential W and electric potential q the partial DN map $\Lambda'_{W,q} : H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega) \to H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_{-,2\epsilon_0}(e_n))$ by

$$\Lambda'_{W,q} f = (\Lambda_{W,q} f) \mid_{\partial\Omega_{-,2\epsilon_0}(e_n)} \qquad \forall f \in H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega)$$

with the associated operator norm

$$\|\Lambda'_{W,q}\|' := sup\{\|\Lambda'_{W,q} f\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_{-,2\epsilon_0}(e_n))} \mid \|f\|_{H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega)} = 1\}$$

Given two sets of electric and magnetic potentials (W_1, q_1) and (W_2, q_2) we wish to estimate their difference in terms of $\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'$. More precisely,

Theorem 7.1 *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. For all $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $\lambda > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$\|I_\Omega d(W_1 - W_2)\|^2_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\{\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^{\lambda} + |log|log\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'||^{-2}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le M$ $(l = 1, 2)$ and $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Here $I_\Omega(x)$ is the indicator function of Ω.

Theorem 7.2 *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. For all $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $\lambda > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$\|I_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)\|^2_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\{\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^{\lambda} + |log|log\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'||^{-\lambda}\}$$

holds for all $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le M$, $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le M$ $(l = 1, 2)$ and $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Here $I_\Omega(x)$ is the indicator function of Ω.

We conclude the introduction with a geometric observation which will be useful later. If we denote by $N(\delta) = \{\tilde{\gamma} \in S^{n-1} \mid d_{S^{n-1}}(\tilde{\gamma}, e_n) \le \delta\}$ to be a δ-neighbourhood around e_n on S^{n-1} then for each $\epsilon_0 > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\partial\Omega_{-,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}) \subset \partial\Omega_{-,2\epsilon_0}(e_n), \quad \forall \tilde{\gamma} \in N(\delta)$$

A simple geometric argument shows that for each $\delta > 0$ there exists a $r_1 > 0$ such that if $a \in \mathbb{R}, b > 0$ are real numbers satisfying $|a| \le r_1 b$ then $\frac{be_n - ae_j}{|be_n - ae_j|} \in N(\delta) \cap span\{e_n, e_j\}$. With this fact as motivation we define for each $j \in \{1, .., n-1\}$ the j-wedge by

$$E_j := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\xi_n| \le r_1 \xi_j\}$$

Our proof of stability will be in two steps. First we will prove stability of the Fourier transform only in the j-wedge. We will then use a stable analytic continuation result to obtain stability of the Fourier transform in a ball of arbitrary radius. With this strategy in mind we will proceed with the next section on some necessary estimates.

8 Preliminary Estimates

In this section we state without proof two estimates which will be useful in deriving the partial data stability estimate. The proofs are given in the references. The first is a Caleman estimate which will allow us to bound the information we don't have on $\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}$ by the information we do have on $\partial\Omega_{-,\epsilon_0}$. We begin by first defining the notion of a limiting Carleman weight.

Definition 8.1 *A real smooth function φ on $\tilde{\Omega}$ is said to be a limiting Carleman weight if it has non-vanishing gradient on $\tilde{\Omega}$ and satisfies*

$$< \varphi''\nabla\varphi, \nabla\varphi > + < \varphi''\xi, \xi >= 0 \quad \textit{when} \;\; \xi^2 = (\nabla\varphi)^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \nabla\varphi \cdot \xi = 0$$

We now state the estimate we will use.

Proposition 8.1 *[4] Let $\tilde{\Omega}$, Ω be bounded open subsets in R^n such that $\Omega \subset\subset \tilde{\Omega}$ and φ be a C^∞ limiting Carleman weight on $\tilde{\Omega}$. For every $M > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that for all C^1 vector fields A on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $max(\|A\|_{C^1(\Omega)}, \|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \leq M$, the following estimate holds*

$$-h(\partial_\nu\varphi e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}\partial_\nu u \mid e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}\partial_\nu u)_{\partial\Omega_-} + \|e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}} h\nabla u\|^2 \leq Ch^2\|e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}} H_{A,q}u\|^2 + h(\partial_\nu\varphi e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}\partial_\nu u \mid e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}\partial_\nu u)_{\partial\Omega_+} \quad (26)$$

for all $0 < h < h_0$ and $u \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$.

We will apply this proposition in the case when the limiting Carleman weight is $x \cdot \tilde{\gamma}$ with $\tilde{\gamma} \in N(\delta)$. The result will be the type of estimates on the difference of the Fourier transform that we have been seeing in part II. However, this time the estimate is only valid on a small wedge in phase space instead of an entire ball. To remedy this problem we follow the idea of Heck-Wang in [5] and use a stable dependence result for analytic continuation established by Vessella to extend the estimate on the wedge to an estimate on the ball.

Proposition 8.2 *[14] Let B_2 denote the open ball of radius 2 centred around the origin and let E be an open subset set of B_1. If f is an analytic function with*

$$\|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \leq \frac{M\alpha!}{\rho^{|\alpha|}}, \qquad \forall\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$$

for some $M, a > 0$ then

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq (2M)^{1-\theta(|E|/|D|)}(\|f\|_{L^\infty(E)})^{\theta(|E|/|D|)}$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1)$ depends on ρ and n.

We will see later that the neccesity of this estimate is what contributes to the *log log* rate of convergence for the partial data as oppose to the *log*-type stability we have for the full data problem. I would be interesting to see whether one can refine such an estimate and consequently derive a *log*-type estimate for the partial data problem.

9 Partial Data Estimate for the Magnetic Field

We prove theorem 7.1 in this section. We begin again with a discussion of (CGO) solutions. Note that this time we are only allowed to consider phase variables ξ in the wedge E_j. This is due to

the fact that we need $\tilde{\gamma} \in N(\delta)$ for the estimate in proposition 8.1 to apply.
For all $\xi \in E_j$ $(j = 1, ..n-1)$ such that $\xi_j \neq 0$, define $\tilde{\gamma} := \frac{\xi_j e_n - \xi_n e_j}{|\xi_j e_n - \xi_n e_j|} \in N(\delta)$. Here E_j and δ are chosen as in the introduction of Part II.
Choose $\gamma \perp \tilde{\gamma}$, $\gamma \perp \xi$, $|\gamma| = 1$ and define $\mu = \gamma + i\tilde{\gamma}$. For each $s \geq |\xi|$ let

$$\zeta_1(s) = \zeta_1 = -is\tilde{\gamma} + g(\xi, s)\gamma + \xi$$

$$\zeta_2(s) = \zeta_2 = is\tilde{\gamma} + g(\xi, s)\gamma - \xi$$

where $g(\xi, s) = \sqrt{s^2 - |\xi|^2}$. Note that $\zeta_l(s)$ can be written as $\zeta_l(s) = (-1)^l is\tilde{\gamma} + s\gamma'_l$ $(l = 1, 2)$ provided we take

$$\gamma'_1 = \frac{g(\xi, s)\gamma + \xi}{s}, \quad \gamma'_2 = \frac{g(\xi, s)\gamma - \xi}{s}$$

Let $\sigma_0 > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ be chosen so that $0 < \sigma_0 < \sigma_0 + \theta < \frac{1}{4n+6}$. Given any $W_1, W_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that $W_1 = W_2$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$, extend them to compactly supported vector fields $\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \in W^{1,p}_c(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ as described in lemma 5.4. Therefore, there exists an $M' > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that $\tilde{W}_l \in \mathcal{W}(M', R)$ whenever $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$. Proposition 4.1 then gives a $C > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, and $0 < \epsilon < \sigma_0(1 - \frac{n}{p})$ such that for all $|\zeta_l| \geq \frac{1}{h_0}$ there exists solutions $u_l(x, \zeta_l)$ to $H_{\tilde{W}_l, q_l} u_l = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that are of the form:

$$u_l(x, \zeta_l) = e^{i\zeta_l \cdot x}(e^{i\chi_{|\zeta_l|}\varphi_l^\sharp} + r_l(x, \zeta_l)) \quad \|r_l(\cdot, \zeta_l)\|_{H^t_\delta} \leq C|\zeta_l|^{t-\epsilon} \quad t \in [0, 2] \quad -1 < \delta < 0$$

$$\varphi_l^\sharp(x) = -\frac{\gamma'_l + (-1)^l i\tilde{\gamma}}{2\pi} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\tilde{W}_l^\sharp(x - \gamma'_l y_1 - (-1)^l \tilde{\gamma} y_2)}{y_1 + iy_2}$$

where $\chi_{|\zeta_l|} = \chi(x/|\zeta_l|^\theta)$ and $\tilde{W}_l^\sharp = \int |\zeta_l|^{n\sigma_0} \chi(y|\zeta_l|^{\sigma_0}) \tilde{W}_l(x - y) dy$
Note here that C, h_0, and ϵ depend on dimension, Ω, θ, σ_0 and M only but not on the choice of (W_l, q_l) as long as $\|W_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq M$ and $\|q_l\|_{L^\infty} \leq M$. All constants in this section will have only the aforementioned dependence.

9.1 Stability of Fourier Transform in a Cone

In this section we derive an estimate for the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}(\partial_j(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_n - \partial_n(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_j)(\xi)$ in the wedge $\xi \in E_j$. The main proposition is

Lemma 9.1 *The following estimate holds for all $\xi \in E_j$ such that $|\xi| \leq s$*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{\xi_j(W_1 - W_2)_n - \xi_n(W_1 - W_2)_j\}dx\right| \\ &\leq C|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - |\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof
For each $\xi \in E_j$ let $\tilde{\gamma} := \frac{\xi_j e_n - \xi_n e_j}{|\xi_j e_n - \xi_n e_j|} \in N(\delta)$ and u_1, u_2 be the CGO solutions considered at the beginning of the section. We start with equation (17)

$$\begin{aligned} 2s\int_\Omega \bar{\mu} \cdot (W_1 - W_2)e^{2i\xi\cdot x} &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \bar{u}_2(\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2})u_1 \\ &+ \int_\Omega (W_1^2 - W_2^2 + q_2 - q_1)\bar{u}_2 u_1 + f_1(x, s) + f_2(x, s)dx + G(\xi, s) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where f_1, f_2, and $G(\xi, s)$ are as in lemma 5.6 and 5.5. From the estimates in these two lemmas we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_\Omega (W_1^2 - W_2^2 + q_2 - q_1)\bar{u}_2 u_1 + f_1(x,s) \quad &+ \quad f_2(x,s)dx + G(\xi, s)| \\ &\leq \quad s(s^{-\epsilon} + (\sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - |\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}}) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Denote by v_l to be the solution of $H_{W_l,q_l} v_l = 0$ in Ω and $v_l = u_1$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then the first term of (17) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_{\partial\Omega} \bar{u}_2(\Lambda_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda_{W_2,q_2})u_1| &= |\int_{\partial\Omega_{-,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} \bar{u}_2(\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2})u_1 + \int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} \bar{u}_2 \partial_\nu v| \\ &\leq e^{2D}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + |\int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} \bar{u}_2 \partial_\nu v| \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $D := sup\{|x| \mid x \in \Omega\}$ and $v := v_1 - v_2$. The particular form of u_2 now gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} \bar{u}_2 \partial_\nu v| &= |\int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} e^{-i\bar{\zeta}_2\cdot x}(e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2)\partial_\nu v| \\ &\leq \|e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}}\partial_\nu v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}))} \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Due to lemma 2.1 and the standard theory of the restriction operator, the $\|e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}$ term in (30) satisfies the estimate

$$\|e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C + \|\bar{r}_2\|_{H^{\epsilon/4}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C(1 + \|\chi_\Omega \bar{r}_2\|_{H^{1/2+\epsilon/4}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$$

where χ_Ω is a compactly supported smooth function that is identically one on Ω. Since χ_Ω is compactly supported, we have for all $-1 < \delta < 0$,

$$\|\chi_\Omega \bar{r}_2\|_{H^{1/2+\epsilon/4}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|\chi_\Omega \bar{r}_2\|_{H_\delta^{1/2+\epsilon/4}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|\bar{r}_2\|_{H_\delta^{1/2+\epsilon/4}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

where the constant depends only on Ω and δ. These facts combined with proposition 4.1 then gives the estimate

$$\|e^{-i\bar{\varphi}_2^\sharp} + \bar{r}_2\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C(1 + s^{1/2-3\epsilon/4}) \tag{31}$$

Moving on to the $\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}}\partial_\nu v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}))}$ term in (30) we observe that proposition 8.1 with Carleman weight $(-\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x)$ and operator H_{W_2,q_2} applied to v gives

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_0\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}}\partial_\nu v\|^2_{L^2(\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}))} &\leq (s^{-1}\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x}H_{W_2,q_2}v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_{\partial\Omega_{-,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} |e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x}\partial_\nu v|^2) \\ &\leq s^{-1}\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x}(W_1 - W_2)\cdot\nabla u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD} \\ &\qquad + s^{-1}\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x}(\nabla\cdot(W_1 - W_2) + q_1 - q_2 + W_1^2 - W_2^2)u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(s + s^{-1} + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD}) \end{aligned}$$

for $s >> D$. Combining the above with (31) and substitute the result into inequality (30) we get

$$|\int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} \bar{u}_2\partial_\nu v| \leq C(1 + s^{-1} + s^{1-3\epsilon/4} + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' e^{sD})$$

using the above inequality combined with (28) and (29) we can derive the following estimate from identity (27)

$$|\int_\Omega \bar{\mu}\cdot(W_1-W_2)e^{2i\xi\cdot x}| \leq C(\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}-\Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' e^{sD} + s^{-3\epsilon/4} + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}})$$

Observe that since $Im(-\mu) = Im(\bar{\mu}) = (-\tilde{\gamma})$, the same Carleman weight applies to give the same estimate for $-\mu$ in place of $\bar{\mu}$

$$|\int_\Omega -\mu\cdot(W_1-W_2)e^{2i\xi\cdot x}| \leq C(\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}-\Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' e^{sD} + s^{-3\epsilon/4} + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}})$$

Add the two estimates together and multiply by $|\xi_j e_n - \xi_n e_j|$ we have the desired estimate.□
We have established stability on the wedge E_j for the Fourier transform of the component $\partial_j(W_1-W_2)_n - \partial_n(W_1-W_2)_j$ of the curl. However we still have not established this estimate for the (j,k) component when neither one of them is equal to n. But we will see in the next corollary that this follows immediately from lemma 9.1 - provided we take smaller sets than the ones we originally considered. We define the subset $\tilde{E}_j$ of E_j by

$$\tilde{E}_j := \{\xi \in E_j \mid \xi_n \geq r_1/2\xi_j\}$$

Corollary 9.2 *The following estimate holds for all* $\xi \in \tilde{E}_j \cap \tilde{E}_k$ *such that* $|\xi| \leq s$

$$\begin{aligned}&|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{\xi_j(W_1-W_2)_k - \xi_k(W_1-W_2)_j\}dx| \\ &\leq C|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1}-\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4})\end{aligned}$$

Proof
By lemma 9.1 we have for all ξ in $\tilde{E}_j \cap \tilde{E}_k$

$$\begin{aligned}&|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{\xi_j(W_1-W_2)_n - \xi_n(W_1-W_2)_j\}dx| \\ &\leq C|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1}-\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4})\end{aligned}$$

multiply this inequality by $|\frac{\xi_k}{\xi_n}|$ and use the definition of $\tilde{E}_k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{\frac{\xi_j\xi_k}{\xi_n}(W_1-W_2)_n - \xi_k(W_1-W_2)_j\}dx| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{r_1}|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1}-\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4})\end{aligned}$$

Switching the role of j and k we have the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}&|\int_\Omega e^{2i\xi\cdot x}\{-\frac{\xi_j\xi_k}{\xi_n}(W_1-W_2)_n + \xi_j(W_1-W_2)_k\}dx| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{r_1}|\xi|(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1}-\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-|\xi|^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4})\end{aligned}$$

Add the two inequalities and we get the desired estimate.□

9.2 Proof of Theorem 7.1

We first apply the result of Vessella to extend the estimate we have in a small wedge to an estimate on the entire ball of radius $R \leq s$. Define $f_R(\xi) := \mathcal{F}(\partial_j(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_k - \partial_k(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_j)(R\xi)$. Note that f_R is analytic in B_2 and satisfies the estimate

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha f_R(\xi)| \leq \frac{4Me^{nR}}{(D^{-1})^{|\alpha|}}\alpha! \quad \forall \xi \in B_2$$

where $D := sup\{|x| \mid x \in \Omega\}$ and M is the a-priori upper bound we have for the $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ norm of W_1 and W_2. Proposition 8.2 applies with $E = \tilde{E}_j \cap \tilde{E}_k \cap B_1$ to give the estimate

$$|f_R(\xi)| \leq (8e^{nR}M)^{1-\lambda}(\|f_R\|_{L^\infty(E)})^\lambda \quad \forall \xi \in B_1$$

Here $\lambda \in (0,1)$ depends only on r_1, Ω and the dimension. By the fact that $\tilde{E}_j \cap \tilde{E}_k$ is a cone, we may apply corollary 9.2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_R\|_{L^\infty(E)} &= \|\mathcal{F}(\partial_j(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_k - \partial_k(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_j)\|_{L^\infty(B_R \cap \tilde{E}_j \cap \tilde{E}_k)} \\ &\leq CR(e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + (\sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - R^2/s^2}})^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4}) \end{aligned}$$

as long as $s \geq R$. Combining the two inequalities and use the definition of f_R we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}(\partial_j(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_k - \partial_k(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)_j)\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} &\leq CR^\lambda e^{nR(1-\lambda)} \times \\ & \quad (e^{Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + \sqrt{\frac{R^2}{s^2}}^{1-\frac{n}{p}} + s^{-3\epsilon/4})^\lambda \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

for all $R > 0$ and $s \geq max\{R, 1/h_0\}$. Here we used the fact that $R \leq s$ and for $t \in [0,1]$ we have the inequality $\sqrt{1-t} \geq 1-t$. With this estimate established for each component of $\mathcal{F}(d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2))$, we now compute the $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm of $d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)\|^2_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \int_{B_R} \frac{|\mathcal{F}(d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2))(\xi)|^2}{1+|\xi|^2}d\xi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} \frac{|\mathcal{F}(d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2))(\xi)|^2}{1+|\xi|^2}d\xi \\ &\leq C(R^{2\lambda+n}e^{2(1-\lambda)nR}(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 + (R^2/s^2)^\epsilon + s^{-3\epsilon/2})^\lambda + R^{-2}) \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

here we have assumed without loss of generality that $\epsilon \leq 1-n/p$. We now choose $s = R^2R^{\frac{2\lambda+n}{\lambda\epsilon}}e^{2\frac{1-\lambda}{\epsilon\lambda}nR}$ so that

$$R^{2\lambda+n}e^{2(1-\lambda)nR}(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 + (R^2/s^2)^\epsilon + s^{-3\epsilon/2})^\lambda \leq (e^{e^{KR}}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 + e^{-(1-\lambda)R})^\lambda$$

for some $K > 0$ depending only on Ω, ϵ, and λ. Substitute the above inequality into (33) we get

$$\|d(\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2)\|^2_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C((e^{e^{KR}}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 + e^{-(1-\lambda)R})^\lambda + R^{-2})$$

and we are free to choose $R > 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' \leq e^{-e}$ and set $R = \frac{1}{K}log(log\frac{1}{\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'})$ the proof is complete. $\square$

10 Stability for Electric Potential

In this section we give a sketch of the proof of theorem 7.2. We will omit the details since the proof is simply a combination of techniques employed in the proof of theorem 7.1 and theorem 6.1. First we replace the magnetic potential W_l by W_l' as in the proof of the full data stability and observe that $\Lambda'_{W_l',q_l} = \Lambda'_{W_l,q_l}$. Define u_1, u_2 and v as in proof of lemma 9.1. Following the same steps as in proof of theorem 6.1, we have that for all $\xi \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j$ such that $|\xi| \leq R$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(q_1 - q_2)(2\xi)| &\leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + \|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^*}^{\lambda/2} s + s^{-\epsilon} \\ &\qquad + \int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\gamma})} |\bar{u}_2 \partial_\nu v|) \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

As in the proof of lemma 9.1

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma})} |\bar{u}_2 \partial_\nu v| \leq C(1 + s^{1-3\epsilon/4})\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}} \partial_\nu v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}))} \tag{35}$$

Apply Carleman estimate to the second term on the RHS of (35) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_0 \|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}} \partial_\nu v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_{+,\epsilon_0}(\tilde{\gamma}))}^2 &\leq s^{-1}(\|e^{-s\tilde{\gamma}\cdot x}(W_1' - W_2') \cdot \nabla u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C) + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD} \\ &\leq s^{-1}(\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} s^2 + C) + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD} \\ &\leq s^{-1}(\|W_1' - W_2'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} s^2 + C) + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD} \\ &\leq s^{-1}C(\|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^*} s^2 + 1) + \|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_2} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^2 e^{2sD} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where the last inequality comes from applying lemma 6.2 to $W_1' - W_2'$ then use interpolation inequalities. Combining (36), (35), and (34) we have the following estimate for the Fourier transform of $(q_1 - q_2)$ in the wedge $\xi \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j$

$$|\mathcal{F}(q_1 - q_2)(2\xi)| \leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + s^{-3\epsilon/4} + \|d(W_1 - W_2)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^*}^{\lambda/2} s^2)$$

Theorem 7.1 applies to give

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(q_1 - q_2)(2\xi)| &\leq C(e^{2Ds}\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|' + s^{-3\epsilon/4} \\ &\qquad + (\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{|log(|log\|\Lambda'_{W_1,q_1} - \Lambda'_{W_2,q_2}\|'|)|})^{\lambda/2} s^2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\xi \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j$. The theorem now follows from proposition 8.2 and standard computation.□

References

[1] Alessandrini *Stable Determination of Conductivity by Boundary Measurements*, Appl. Anal. 27 (1988) no. 1-3, 153-172

[2] G. Eskin, J Ralston *Inverse Scattering Problem for the Schrödinger Equation with Magnetic Potential at a Fixed Energy*, Comm. Math. Phys. 173, (1995) p. 199–224

[3] L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, AMS (1998)

[4] Dos Santos Ferreira, Sjöstrand, Kenig, Uhlmann *Determining the Magnetic Field for the Magnetic Schrödinger Operator From Partial Cauchy Data*, preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0601466.

[5] Heck, Wang *Stability Estimates for the Inverse Boundary Value Problem by Partial Cauchy Data*, to appear in Inverse Prob.

[6] Kenig, Sjöstrand, Uhlmann *The Calderon Problem with Partial Data*, to appear in Ann. Math.

[7] Sylvester, Uhlmann *A Global Uniqueness Theorem for an Inverse Boundary Value Problem*, Ann. Math. (2) 125 (1987), no.1 153-169.

[8] G. Nakamura, Z. Sun, G. Uhlmann *Global Identifiability for an Inverse Problem*, Math. Annalen, 303 (1995) p. 377-388

[9] M. Salo, *Semiclassical Pseudodifferential Calculus and the Reconstruction of a Magnetic Field*, to appear in Comm. PDE

[10] G. Schwarz, *Hodge Decomposition - a Method for Solving Boundary Value Problems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, (1995)

[11] Z, Sun, *An Inverse Boundary Value Problem for Schrödinger Operators with Vector Potentials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (1993), 953–969.

[12] X. Raymond *Elementary Introduction to the Theory of Pseudodifferential Operators*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics (1991)

[13] M. Taylor *Partial Differential Equations II*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1996)

[14] S. Vessella, *A Continuous Dependence Result in the Analytic Continuation Prolem*, Forum Math. 11, (1999), no. 6, 695-703